



E-FAN-03-003

March 2003

Food Stamp Leavers Research Study—Study of Nonwelfare Families Leaving the Food Stamp Program in South Carolina

Final Report

By Philip Richardson, Gregg Schoenfeld, Susan LaFever, Frances Jackson, and Mark Tecco, MAXIMUS, Inc.

ERS project representative: Elizabeth Dagata

Abstract

This report presents the results of a study of about 900 nonwelfare families who left the Food Stamp Program (FSP) in South Carolina between October 1998 and March 2000. Nonwelfare families were defined as families who did not receive any benefits under the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program in the 12 months before leaving the FSP. The families were surveyed about 12 months after they left the FSP. The study results show that more than 80 percent of the respondents who were still off of food stamps were either working or living with an employed adult. Employment rates were much higher for Blacks than for Whites. More than 80 percent of the respondents who were working and still off of food stamps were working at least 30 hours per week. Among the unemployed who were still off food stamps, the most common reason for not working was the health condition of the respondent. Many respondents reported an increase in minor hardships since leaving the FSP but a few reported more serious hardships.

This report was prepared by MAXIMUS, Inc., for the South Carolina Department of Social Services under a research grant from the Economic Research Service. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of ERS or USDA.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Marilyn Edelhoch, Director of Research and Evaluation for the South Carolina Department of Social Services (SCDSS), was the Project Officer for this study, which was supported by the Economic Research Services (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Dr. Donald Klos of the Public Services Research Laboratory in Columbia, South Carolina assisted with the selection of the survey samples and with the development of sample weights. The survey questions on child outcomes were developed with input from Child Trends, Inc. Dr. Qiduan Liu of SCDSS assisted in providing the administrative data for the study and in resolving sample design issues. Input into the study design was also provided by Linda Martin, Director of Planning and Research for SCDSS.

Comments on draft versions of the report were coordinated by Ms. Elizabeth Dagata of ERS and by Kristen Hyatt of the Food and Nutrition Service. Mark Nord of ERS provided input on the use of the short version of the USDA food security index.

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	ES-1
A. Policy Background and Objectives of the Study.....	ES-1
B. Summary of the Major Findings.....	ES-2
C. Policy Implications of the Findings	ES-11
I. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	I-1
A. Policy Background of the Study.....	I-2
B. Data Collected and Analyzed	I-5
C. Sample Design and Selection	I-5
D. Survey Methods.....	I-6
E. Survey Response Rates	I-7
F. Organization of the Report	I-8
II. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND RECIDIVISM	II-1
A. Demographic Characteristics	II-1
B. Comparisons with Welfare Leavers.....	II-4
C. Recidivism Among the Survey Respondents	II-5
III.EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS, AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME AMONG RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS.....	III-1
A. Employment Status.....	III-1
B. Types of Jobs.....	III-3
C. Work Hours and Non-Traditional Schedules	III-4
D. Earnings Patterns	III-6
E. Respondents Not Working	III-10
F. Presence of Other Employed Adults	III-12
G. Total Household Income.....	III-18
H. Poverty Status.....	III-21

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Chapter	Page
IV. INDICATORS OF FAMILY WELL-BEING AMONG FAMILIES	
STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS	IV-1
A. Adverse Events.....	IV-1
B. Access to Food	IV-8
C. Access to Health Care	IV-17
D. Life Since Leaving Food Stamps	IV-22
V. CHILD OUTCOMES AND WELL-BEING AMONG FAMILIES	
STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS	V-1
A. Background of the Analysis	V-1
B. Selection of the Focal Child	V-2
C. Findings on Child Outcomes	V-2
D. Neighborhood Quality	V-16
E. Analysis of Findings	V-17
VI. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, CHILD CARE, AND TRANSPORTATION	VI-1
A. Public Assistance and Other Support	VI-1
B. Child Care Use and Payments	VI-5
C. Transportation.....	VI-16
Appendix A: Additional Analysis of Child Outcomes.....	A-1
Appendix B: Administrative Data on the Samples	B-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This report presents the findings of a study of 899 non-welfare families who left Food Stamps in South Carolina between October 1998 and March 2000. Non-welfare families were defined as families who did not receive any benefits under the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program in the 12 months before leaving Food Stamps. Information on the families was gathered through telephone interviews conducted by the MAXIMUS Survey Research Center between October 1999 and April 2001. The study examined two “cohorts” of Food Stamp leavers, as follows:

- families who left Food Stamps between October 1998 and March 1999 (“Cohort One”); and
- families who left Food Stamps between October 1999 and March 2000 (“Cohort Two”).

The tracking of two consecutive “exit cohorts” of Food Stamp leavers is consistent with the approach taken by the South Carolina Department of Social Services (SCDSS) in its earlier studies of TANF leavers. This approach is useful for examining whether outcomes among program leavers are affected by such factors as changes in economic conditions or program policies. With regard to economic conditions in South Carolina, the average monthly unemployment rate during the surveys of the 1998-1999 leavers was 4.2 percent. During the surveys of the 1999-2000 leavers, the average monthly unemployment rate was slightly lower at 3.6 percent. No major changes in the state’s Food Stamp policies were implemented between the two survey periods.

A. POLICY BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Nationally, Food Stamp caseloads as well as TANF caseloads have declined significantly in recent years. While researchers have conducted numerous studies of TANF families who have left welfare and Food Stamps, relatively little attention has been focused on non-TANF families who have left the Food Stamp program.

1. USDA Research Program to Study Food Stamp Leavers

In 1998, the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture awarded grants to four states to conduct research on Food Stamp leavers: Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, and South Carolina. Each of the four states focused on different segments of the Food Stamp population. The South Carolina Department of Social Services chose to focus on two major groups: non-TANF families and Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDs).

Data for the national Food Stamp program for 1997 show that about 21 percent of all Food Stamp cases involved non-TANF families, defined as cases that included children but in which the family was not receiving welfare benefits. A study by the Food and Nutrition

Service (FNS) shows that non-welfare families have increased as a percentage of all families receiving Food Stamps.¹ Between 1994 and 1997, the number of single parents who were on Food Stamps *and* receiving welfare declined by 27 percent. In contrast, the number of single parent families who were on Food Stamps but *not* receiving welfare increased by 9 percent. FNS attributes the difference primarily to the effects of welfare reform.

2. Specific Reasons for Studying Non-Welfare Food Stamp Leavers

While non-welfare families on Food Stamps are not subject to the time limits and new work requirements introduced by PRWORA, their status and well-being after leaving Food Stamps is still of concern to policy makers. The current study of non-welfare Food Stamp leavers in South Carolina was designed to address the following key issues:

- Are non-welfare families who leave Food Stamps meeting their financial and nutritional needs?
- Is there evidence that leaving Food Stamps is associated with negative outcomes for the well-being of children?
- How many of the families who have left Food Stamps may still be eligible for Food Stamps but are not re-enrolling?
- How many of the families who are still eligible for Food Stamps are not accessing benefits because of “administrative hassles”?
- How do one-parent and two-parent families compare in terms of their experiences after leaving Food Stamps?
- What types of non-welfare families are returning to Food Stamps (recidivism) and why?

B. SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

This section presents a summary of the key findings from the surveys. Section C provides a brief discussion of the policy implications of the findings.

Food Stamp Recidivism (Return to Food Stamps) Was Highest Among High School Drop-Outs, Younger Persons, and One-Parent Families

At the time of the follow-up surveys, almost 26 percent of the families in Cohort One and almost 29 percent of the families in Cohort Two reported that they were back on Food Stamps. Among Cohort One, almost 28 percent of the respondents from one-parent cases were

¹ *Who is Leaving the Food Stamp Caseload? — An Analysis of Caseload Changes from 1994 to 1997*, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, March 1999.

back on Food Stamps, compared to only 23 percent of the two-parent sample. Similarly, almost 34 percent of the one-parent cases in Cohort Two were back on Food Stamps, compared to only 24 percent of the two-parent cases.

Education had a substantial impact on Food Stamp recidivism. About 39 percent of high school drop-outs in Cohort One were back on Food Stamps, compared to 24 percent of persons who had completed high school only, and 11 percent of persons who had attended college. For Cohort Two, almost 41 percent of high school drop-outs were back on Food Stamps, compared to 25 percent of persons who had completed high school without going to college, and 30 percent of those who had attended college. Recidivism was also affected by age. In Cohort One, about 37 percent of respondents aged 18-29 were back on Food Stamps, compared to 16 percent of respondents aged 40 and older. In Cohort Two, almost 38 percent of the persons aged 18-24 were back on Food Stamps, compared to only 19 percent of persons aged 40 and older.

More Than 80 Percent of the Persons Who Were Still Off Food Stamps Were Either Working or Living with an Employed Adult at the Time of the Surveys

Among both cohorts, about 83 percent of the persons who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys were either working or living with an employed adult. In Cohort One, almost 84 percent of the respondents in *one-parent cases* were either working or living with an employed adult, including 78 percent who were working themselves. Among the *two-parent families*, only 61 percent of the respondents were working themselves, but 85 percent were either working or living with an employed adult. Similar results were found for Cohort Two.

Employment Rates Among Persons Still off Food Stamps Were Much Higher for Blacks than for Whites

Among Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps, 82 percent of blacks in one-parent cases reported that they themselves were working at the time of the surveys, compared to only 64 percent of whites. In Cohort Two, the corresponding percentages for one-parent cases were 81 percent for blacks and 69 percent for whites. In two-parent cases, 71 percent of blacks in Cohort One were working, compared to only 54 percent of whites. The percentages for two-parent cases in Cohort Two were 67 percent for blacks and 58 percent for whites.

Education Also Had a Major Impact on Employment Among Persons Still off Food Stamps

Education had a major impact on employment rates among respondents still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. Among Cohort One, only 58 percent of the high school drop-outs in one-parent cases were employed, compared to 80 percent of persons who had completed high school only, and 89 percent of persons who had attended college. Among Cohort Two, 61 percent of the high school drop-outs in single-parent cases were employed, compared to 80 percent of persons who had completed high school without going to college,

and 92 percent of those who had attended college. In two-parent cases, education had somewhat less impact in terms of employment rates among the respondents.

Of the Persons Who Were Working and Still Off Food Stamps, More Than 80 Percent Were Working at Least 30 Hours per Week

Of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps, two-thirds of the employed respondents in one-parent cases were working 40 or more hours per week, and 91 percent were working 30 or more hours per week. Among Cohort Two, 69 percent of employed respondents in one-parent cases were working 40 or more hours per week, and 86 percent were working 30 or more hours per week.

The comparable figures for employed respondents in two-parent cases were somewhat lower. In Cohort One, for example, 81 percent of employed respondents in two-parent cases were working 30 or more hours. The percentage for Cohort Two was 85 percent. In many two-parent cases, however, the work hours of the respondents were supplemented by the employment of the spouse/partner.

More than 70 Percent of the Employed Persons Who Were Still off Food Stamps Were Earning Over \$1,000 Per Month, But About 10 Percent Were Earning Less than \$750 Per Month

Of the respondents who were employed and still off Food Stamps, 73 percent of the Cohort One and 71 percent of Cohort Two were earning more than \$1,000 per month. Median monthly earnings in one-parent cases were about \$1,300 in both samples. However, 9 percent of employed single parents in Cohort One were earning less than \$750 per month. For Cohort Two, the figure was 11 percent. Median monthly earnings among employed respondents in two-parent cases were somewhat lower (about \$1,200), but these earnings were supplemented by the wages of the spouse in many cases. Earnings were higher for persons who had attended college, especially in Cohort Two.

Statewide data for 2000 show that the average monthly earnings of employed workers in South Carolina were about \$2,345, based on the UI wage reporting system. Most of the survey respondents, therefore, were earning much less than the statewide average. This is due to the fact that the majority of the leavers were working in low-skilled occupations. Despite this, the majority of employed leavers were financially better off than when they were on Food Stamps, especially since none of them had been receiving TANF benefits.

Most Employed Persons Who Were Still off Food Stamps Were Making More than \$7 Per Hour

Overall, about 60 percent of the employed respondents in Cohort One and 72 percent of the employed respondents in Cohort Two were earning \$7 per hour or higher. Only 20 percent of employed respondents in Cohort One and 14 percent of employed persons in Cohort Two

were earning less than \$6 per hour. Earnings and hourly wage rates varied considerably by occupation, with wages generally higher in manufacturing and office/clerical jobs, and lower in service and retail jobs.

Among Unemployed Persons Who Were Still off Food Stamps, the Most Common Reason for Not Working Was the Health Condition of the Respondent

Among unemployed respondents who were still off Food Stamps, the most common reason given for not working was the health of the respondents. This reason was cited by 33 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort One and 31 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort Two. The health condition of a child or other family member was cited by 7 percent of the unemployed respondents in Cohort One and 11 percent of the unemployed respondents in Cohort Two.

In two-parent cases, about one-quarter of unemployed respondents said that they preferred to stay home with their children. In many of these cases, the respondent's spouse or parent was working. Difficulty finding jobs was cited by 11-12 percent of unemployed persons. Child care problems were mentioned by almost 11 percent of unemployed respondents in both cohorts.

About 27 Percent of the Persons Who Were Still Off Food Stamps Were Receiving Child Support

About 27 percent of the respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys reported that they received child support. The percentage was the same for both samples of leavers. In single-parent cases, 39 percent of Cohort One and 33 percent Cohort Two reported that they were receiving child support.

Some of the Respondents Who Were Still Off Food Stamps Had Very Low Household Incomes

Of the Cohort respondents who were still off Food Stamps, 6 percent reported that they had total household income of less than \$500 per month, including earnings, child support, SSI, unemployment benefits, and other cash income. About 21 percent had household income below \$1,000 per month. Among Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps, 11 percent had household income below \$500 and 37 percent had income below \$1,000 per month.

In one-parent cases, about 28-29 percent of the respondents who were still off Food Stamps identified child support as a primary source of income. About 14 percent of Cohort One and 19 percent of Cohort Two identified SSI as a primary source of income.

A Majority of the Respondents Who Were Still off Food Stamps Had Household Incomes That Might Make them Eligible for Food Stamp Benefits

An analysis of total household income showed that 55 percent of the Cohort One families who were still off Food Stamps, and 72 percent of the Cohort Two families who were still off Food Stamps, were below 130 percent of the poverty level, indicating that they might potentially be eligible to receive Food Stamps. Overall, 35 percent of the Cohort One families who were still off Food Stamps were living below the poverty level. The percentage for Cohort Two was 41 percent. One-parent families were more likely than two-parent families to be living below poverty.

Respondents Who Cited Administrative Hassles or Pride/Dignity as Reasons for Not Being on Food Stamps Were More Likely than Other Respondents to be Potentially Still Eligible for Food Stamps

Administrative hassles, pride/dignity, and related factors were cited by a significant number of respondents. For example, about 24 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps said that a major reason why they were not on Food Stamps was that they did not want to deal with the program. This included not wishing to deal with the hassles of the program, difficulty complying with paperwork and reporting requirements, not wanting to be on Food Stamps because of pride or dignity, and simply not wishing to be on Food Stamps.

Of the Cohort One respondents who said that they were off Food Stamps because of administrative hassles, pride/dignity, or because they simply did not want to be on Food Stamps, 67 percent were living below 130 percent of poverty. Almost 49 percent were living below 100 percent of poverty. In contrast, only 42 percent of the respondents who said that they were off Food Stamps because of employment and earnings had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty, and only 21 percent were below 100 percent of poverty. Similar overall results were found for Cohort Two.

Many Respondents Reported an Increase in Minor Hardships Since Leaving Food Stamps but Few Reported the More Serious Hardships, Such as Going Without Heat or Electricity, Being Homeless, or Having to Place Their Children With Someone Else

Many of the survey respondents who were still off Food Stamps reported an increase in minor hardships in the year since leaving Food Stamps – such as having problems with utility bills or rent payments. However, relatively few respondents reported the more serious types of hardship, such as having heat or electricity cut off, being homeless, or having to place their children with someone else.

About 10 percent of Cohort One respondents had their electricity cut off at some time in the year since leaving Food Stamps, compared to 7 percent in the period before leaving Food Stamps. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 3 percent to 11 percent. Almost 6 percent of Cohort One had gone without heat at some time in the past year, and 8

percent had gone without water – only slightly higher than before leaving Food Stamps. About 7 percent of Cohort Two had gone without heat at some time in the past year, and 8 percent had gone without water – both increases from the year before leaving Food Stamps.

Only 1.6 percent of Cohort One and 4.8 percent of Cohort Two reported that they had to place their children with someone else in the past year, and less than 1 percent of persons in either sample had stayed in a homeless shelter.

Impact of the Recession -- the Cohort Two Respondents Were More Likely Than the Cohort One Respondents to Report an Increase in Hardships in the Past Year. This May Have Reflected the Impact of the Recession

One of the key findings from the surveys is that respondents in Cohort Two reported experiencing more hardships in the past year than before the last year, while respondents in Cohort One were generally less likely to report an increase in hardships. For example, the percentage who had to move because they could not afford housing increased from 6 percent to 11 percent. The percentage who fell behind on a utility bill increased from 15 percent to 49 percent. There was also a significant increase in the percentage who had gone without heat, water, or electricity, and who had had their telephone cut off. In addition, the percentage who had sent their children to live with someone else for financial reasons increased by a factor of three.

A possible explanation for these findings is that the Cohort Two respondents were dealing with the beginnings of the recession at the time when they were interviewed. In contrast, the Cohort One respondents were interviewed before the recession began.

Food Insecurity Increased Among Families Still off Food Stamps

About 25 percent of Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps reported that there had been times in the past year when they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals due to lack of money. This was an increase from 15 percent in the period before leaving Food Stamps. For Cohort Two, the percentage rose from 9 percent to almost 31 percent.

The percentage of respondents who reported that they had to skip meals or cut the size of meals in the past year did not vary by current employment status. However, the percentage was much higher among whites than among blacks.

Of the respondents who reported having to cut the size of meals or skip meals in the past year, almost 37 percent said that it happened every month, an increase from 27 percent for the period before leaving Food Stamps. Overall, 9 percent of the respondents reported that they had to skip meals or cut the size of meals every month in the past year.

About 27 percent of Cohort One respondents reported that there had been times in the past year when they had eaten less than they felt they should because of lack of money to buy food. This was an increase from 22 percent before leaving Food Stamps. For Cohort Two,

the percentage increased from 11 percent to 26 percent. Almost 11 percent of Cohort One reported that there had been times in the past year when they were hungry but did not eat. This was unchanged from the period before leaving Food Stamps. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 5.0 percent to 7.6 percent.

The short version of the USDA's food security index was used to measure food security among Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps. About 53 percent of the respondents were food secure, almost 32 percent were food insecure without hunger, and 15 percent were food insecure with hunger. About 18 percent of the one-parent cases were food insecure with hunger.

Persons Who Were Unemployed and Not Living with an Employed Adult Were Especially at Risk of Hunger, as Measured by the USDA Food Security Index

Among the Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps, food security did not vary much in terms of the employment status of the respondents themselves. However, food insecurity was especially high among persons who were not working and not living with an employed adult – about 27 percent of these respondents were food insecure with hunger.

About 10 Percent of the Respondents Reported Problems with Access to Health Care Since Leaving Food Stamps -- Largely Unchanged from the Period Before leaving Food Stamps

In both samples, about 10 percent of the persons who were still off Food Stamps reported that there had been times in the past year when they needed medical care for a family member but could not afford it. This compares to 9 percent for the period before leaving Food Stamps. Respondents in two-parent cases were more likely than respondents in one-parent cases to report having a problem with health care access since leaving Food Stamps.

Almost 20 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were not currently on Medicaid reported a problem with health care access in the past year. The percentage for Cohort Two families not on Medicaid was 15 percent. Whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to report having a problem with health care access.

About 21 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps reported that they or someone whom they lived with did not have health care coverage, including 25 percent of the respondents in one-parent cases, but only 18 percent of the respondents in two-parent cases. Among Cohort Two, however, only 13 percent reported that they or someone they lived with did not have health coverage. About 5 percent of the Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps reported that they had at least one child without health coverage.

A Majority of the Families Who Were Still Off Food Stamps Reported That They or Someone in Their Household Were Getting Medicaid Benefits

Overall, 65 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps reported that they or a household member were enrolled in Medicaid, including 72 percent of the two-parent families but only 59 percent of the one-parent families. Of the Cohort Two respondents still off Food Stamps, 72 percent reported that they or a household member were using Medicaid. Almost 9 percent of Cohort One and 13 percent of Cohort Two were receiving SSI.

There Was Little Evidence That Child Behavior, Temperament, or School Performance Had Been Negatively Affected by the Parent(s) Leaving Food Stamps

Respondents who were still off Food Stamps were asked a series of questions about changes in the behavior, attitudes, temperament, and school performance of their children in the past year. The major goal of the analysis was to determine whether there was any evidence that leaving Food Stamps was associated with negative child outcomes. Overall, less than 10 percent of the respondents in either sample reported that their child's behavior, temperament, or school performance had worsened in the last year. Many of the respondents reported improvement in child behavior, temperament, and school performance, but this may have been due to normal child development or other factors. For several of the measures, child outcomes were better among employed respondents, blacks, more educated respondents, and two-parent families. However, the impact of these variables was not always consistent across the two samples.

The Majority of the Respondents Who Were Still Off Food Stamps Rated Their Child's Health as Excellent or Very Good

Almost 41 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps rated their child's health as excellent, and 26 percent rated it very good. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 36 percent and 27 percent. About 8 percent of Cohort One and 10 percent of Cohort Two rated their child's health as fair or poor. Only 1.4 percent of Cohort One and 3.5 percent of Cohort Two rated their child's health as being worse than a year ago. About 91 percent of the leavers in both samples reported that they had a regular source of medical care for their children.

Most of the Respondents Who Were Still off Food Stamps Thought That Life Was Better Since Leaving Food Stamps

Almost 87 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps agreed with the statement that life was better since leaving the Food Stamps. For Cohort Two, the figure was 85 percent. However, almost 58 percent of Cohort One and 52 percent of Cohort Two also agreed with the statement that they worried more about their family than a year ago. Respondents who were unemployed were much more likely than employed respondents to be more worried about their families than a year previously.

A Large Percentage of the Respondents Experienced Changes in Household Composition After Leaving Food Stamps

The follow-up surveys found that family structure among the respondents changed considerably during the 12 months after they left Food Stamps, especially for two-parent families. Among the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys, 23 percent of the two-parent sample were no longer living with a spouse or partner, and 17 percent said that no other adults were living in the household. Among Cohort Two, about 32 percent of the respondents in the two-parent sample were no longer living with a spouse or partner. Of the one-parent cases in Cohort One, 18 percent were now living with a spouse or partner. Of the one-parent cases in Cohort Two, almost 12 percent were now living with a spouse or partner.

More Than a Third of the Single-Parent Respondents Were Living with Another Adult

About 39 percent of the one-parent cases in Cohort One said that there was at least one other adult in the household. Among Cohort Two, 35 percent of the one-parent sample reported that they were living with at least one other adult.

About Half of the Respondents Who Were Still off Food Stamps Had a Child Enrolled in the School Lunch Program, but WIC Enrollment Was Lower

Almost 47 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were off Food Stamps had a child enrolled in the school lunch program, including 52 percent of the one-parent families and 41 percent of two-parent families. Almost 55 percent of the Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps were using the school lunch program.

Almost 22 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps were enrolled in the WIC program, including 18 percent of one-parent families and 26 percent of two-parent families. Of the Cohort Two respondents who were still off Food Stamps, 15 percent were using the WIC program. It is not known how many of the families might have been eligible for WIC at the time of the surveys.

Of the Families Who Were Paying for Child Care, Very Few Were Receiving Assistance with the Payments

Of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps, only 6.3 percent of the one-parent families who were using paid child care for their *pre-school* children were receiving help in paying for the care. For two-parent families, the percentage was 8.6 percent. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 6.7 percent and 4.4 percent. Of the one-parent families in Cohort One who were using paid child care for their *school-age* children, only 12.7 percent were receiving help. The figure for Cohort Two was 10.5 percent.

C. IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The results of the study show some generally positive findings in certain areas, but also raise a number of concerns. The implications of the findings are reviewed briefly below.

1. Positive Findings

On the positive side, about 83 percent of the families who were still off Food Stamps were working or living with an employed adult (this was true for both cohorts). Of those who were employed, more than 80 percent were working at least 30 hours per week. More than 70 percent of the employed respondents were making more than \$1,000 per month. Among persons who were not working, almost one-third of Cohort One and about half of Cohort Two had worked at some time in the past year.

Although there was some evidence that minor hardships had increased among families in the year since they left Food Stamps, there was not a significant increase in the more severe types of hardship, such as homelessness. With regard to poverty, the findings on household income indicate that about 65 percent of the Cohort One families who were still off Food Stamps were living above the poverty level. The figure for Cohort Two was 59 percent. Finally, the data on child behavior, school performance, and child well-being do not indicate any major negative trends in child outcomes among families who had left Food Stamps.

2. Areas for Concern and Policy Implications

While the data on employment and other indicators were positive in many areas, some of the leavers were not faring as well as others. High school drop-outs, in particular, had much lower employment rates and earnings than more educated respondents. The data from the study do not show the precise reasons why high school drop-outs were experiencing problems in the labor market. While part of the problem may simply be related to employer requirements for high school diplomas, another factor may be literacy problems or learning disabilities. Overall, the findings suggest that high school drop-outs in the Food Stamp caseload might benefit from additional services as they try to make the transition toward self-sufficiency.

A second area of concern is the high rate of recidivism among the sample due to employment barriers. Overall, about 26 percent of Cohort One and 29 percent of Cohort Two were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. Recidivism was even higher among one-parent families. Much of the recidivism seems to be related to difficulties finding and keeping good-paying jobs, suggesting that non-welfare Food Stamp leavers might benefit from more help with job search assistance, job referrals, and other employment-related services. Recidivism rates were also much higher for respondents who had not completed high school (about 40 percent for both cohorts), indicating that they were experiencing significant problems leaving the Food Stamp rolls on a permanent basis.

With regard to food security, the findings suggest that while there was not a major increase in hunger after families left Food Stamps, food insecurity did increase, especially for one-parent families. The findings indicate that many of the families remained at risk of hunger, particularly high school drop-outs and other respondents who were having trouble staying employed. The persons most at risk of hunger were those who were not working and not living with an employed adult. About 27 percent of the respondents in this group in Cohort Two were food insecure with hunger present.

In terms of poverty, about 35 percent of families who were off Food Stamps in Cohort One were still living below the poverty level. The figure for Cohort Two was 41 percent. One-parent families, high school drop-outs, and respondents aged 30 and over were the most likely to be living below the poverty level. In the area of health care, about 21 percent of Cohort One families who were still off Food Stamps did not have health care coverage. The figure for Cohort Two was 13 percent. About 10 percent of both samples reported problems paying for medical care in the past year.

Another area of concern is that a large percentage of Food Stamp leavers seemed to be staying off Food Stamps for reasons related to administrative hassles or reluctance to access the program. About 24 percent of the families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the survey said that they were staying off the program because of administrative requirements, pride/dignity, and other factors unrelated to employment. The data suggest that as many as two-thirds of these families might still be eligible for Food Stamp benefits based on household income, (although some of these families may be over the asset limit). In regard to policy implications, more steps may have to be taken to address problems encountered by families in accessing benefits, including recertification requirements, reporting of income changes, and verification requirements.

Closely related to this issue is the broader question of Food Stamp participation rates among eligible low-income families. The study indicates that as many as 55 percent of all the Cohort One families who were still off Food Stamps might still have been eligible for benefits based on household income. The figure for Cohort Two was even higher at 72 percent. Since we do not have complete information on the assets of these households and other factors that may affect eligibility, it is not possible to determine how many would actually have qualified for benefits. In addition, some of the families might have been eligible for only small amounts of Food Stamps because of their earnings. However, the study suggests that many of the families who were no longer on Food Stamps were still eligible for benefits.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This report presents findings from a study of 899 non-TANF families who left Food Stamps in South Carolina between October 1998 and March 2000. The study provides information on the status of the families about one year after they left Food Stamps. Information on the sample of Food Stamp leavers was collected through telephone surveys.

The report was produced as part of a larger study of Food Stamp leavers in South Carolina. Under the study, two samples of Food Stamp leavers were surveyed:

- a sample of non-welfare Food Stamp families, including one-parent and two-parent families; and
- a sample of Food Stamp leavers who were Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDs).

This report presents the findings for the non-welfare families. The study examined two “cohorts” of Food Stamp leavers, as follows:

- families who left Food Stamps between October 1998 and March 1999 (“Cohort One”); and
- families who left Food Stamps between October 1999 and March 2000 (“Cohort Two”).

The tracking of two consecutive “exit cohorts” of Food Stamp leavers is consistent with the approach the South Carolina Department of Social Services (SCDSS) has taken in its earlier studies of TANF leavers. This approach is useful for examining whether outcomes among program leavers are affected by such factors as changes in economic conditions, caseload composition, or program policies. With regard to economic conditions in South Carolina, the average monthly unemployment rate during the surveys of Cohort 1 was 4.2 percent. During the surveys of Cohort 2, the average monthly unemployment rate was slightly lower at 3.6 percent. No major changes in the state’s Food Stamp policies were implemented between the two survey periods.

Information on the families was gathered through telephone interviews conducted from the MAXIMUS Survey Research Center between October 1999 and April 2001. The study of non-welfare Food Stamp leavers is part of a broader study of Food Stamp leavers in South Carolina. The other major component of the study involves a follow-up study of ABAWDs who left Food Stamps. Findings on the ABAWDs are available in a separate report.

A. POLICY BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Nationally, Food Stamp caseloads as well as TANF caseloads have declined significantly in recent years. While researchers have conducted numerous studies of TANF families who have left welfare and Food Stamps, relatively little attention has been focused on non-TANF families who have left the Food Stamp program.

1. USDA Research Program to Study Food Stamp Leavers

In 1998, the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture awarded grants to four states to conduct research on Food Stamp leavers: Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, and South Carolina. Each of the four states focused on different segments of the Food Stamp population. The South Carolina Department of Social Services (SCDSS) chose to focus on two major groups: non-TANF families and ABAWDs. The reason for focusing on non-TANF families was that South Carolina was already in the process of conducting extensive follow-up surveys of families who had left the TANF program.¹ SCDSS wanted to know more about the status and well-being of families who had left Food Stamps but who had not been on TANF.

2. Information on Non-Welfare Families in the Food Stamp Caseload

Data for the national Food Stamp program for 1997 show that about 21 percent of all Food Stamp cases involved non-TANF families, defined as cases that included children but in which the family was not receiving welfare benefits. Data published by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) indicate that non-welfare families have increased as a percentage of all families receiving Food Stamps.² The FNS analysis showed that between 1994 and 1997, the number of single parents who were on Food Stamps *and* receiving welfare declined by 27 percent. In contrast, the number of single parent families who were on Food Stamps but *not* receiving welfare increased by 9 percent. FNS attributes the difference primarily to the effects of welfare reform.

One reason for the relative lack of attention paid to non-welfare Food Stamp leavers is that these families were not directly affected by most of the provisions of the 1996 welfare reform legislation. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) did have a major impact on welfare families and childless adults in the Food Stamp population, as follows:

- Under the welfare reform legislation, TANF families became subject to time limits on cash assistance and to strict new work requirements, with the states having considerable flexibility to establish their own policies in these areas.

¹ For the latest report on South Carolina's TANF leavers, see *Welfare Leavers and Diverters Research Study: One-Year Follow-Up of Welfare Leavers*, MAXIMUS, March 2001.

² *Who is Leaving the Food Stamp Caseload? — An Analysis of Caseload Changes from 1994 to 1997*, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, March 1999.

- Studies by FNS suggest that the welfare reform legislation has indirectly been responsible for part of the decline in Food Stamp caseloads nationwide.
- Under the 1996 legislation, ABAWDs are limited to 3 months of Food Stamp benefits in a 36-month period unless they meet work requirements or live in exempt areas characterized by poor economic conditions.

Although non-TANF Food Stamp families have not been affected by many of the provisions of PRWORA, there are legitimate reasons for studying these families after they leave Food Stamps, as highlighted in the next section.

3. Specific Reasons for Studying Non-Welfare Food Stamp Leavers

While non-welfare families on Food Stamps are not subject to the time limits and new work requirements introduced by PRWORA, their status and well-being after leaving Food Stamps is still of concern to policy makers. The current study of non-welfare Food Stamp leavers in South Carolina was designed to address the following key issues.

Are Non-Welfare Families Who Leave Food Stamps Meeting their Financial and Nutritional Needs?

For example, are the parents employed, and if so, are they earning enough money to support their families? If they are not working and are still off Food Stamps, what other types of income do they have? How many of the families are experiencing food insecurity and other types of hardship? If unemployed, what are the reasons why parents are not working?

With regard to poverty, what percentage of the families who are still off Food Stamps have escaped poverty? Which sub-groups are having the most difficulty leaving poverty?

How Has Leaving Food Stamps Affected the Well-Being of Children?

Leaving Food Stamps may affect the well-being of children in a variety of ways. If families successfully leave Food Stamps and achieve stable employment that provides a higher standard of living for their children, the children may benefit materially from improved housing conditions and developmentally from more positive role models. However, if families leave Food Stamps but are unable to maintain steady employment, children may experience reduced living standards, poor nutrition, and other hardships. This may affect children in a number of ways, including health, school performance, behavior patterns, and overall adjustment. Even in cases where families do achieve stable employment after leaving Food Stamps, the parent's movement into the workforce may create stresses for children. For example, the children may have to be placed in child care arrangements whose quality and stability may vary.

How Many of the Families Who Have Left Food Stamps May Still Be Eligible for Food Stamps But Are Not Re-Enrolling?

In recent years, concern has been expressed by federal and state policy makers that many of the families who leave Food Stamps may still be eligible for benefits based on income, but are not participating in the program for various reasons. A study by the Urban Institute estimated that about two-thirds of families who left Food Stamps at some time between 1995 and 1997 were still eligible for Food Stamps based on income data collected through the National Survey of American Families (NSAF).³

The authors found that the percentage of leavers who might still be eligible for Food Stamps did not differ greatly between TANF and non-TANF families who had left Food Stamps. For example, 65 percent of TANF families who had left Food Stamps had incomes below 130 percent of the federal poverty level – the gross income test for Food Stamp eligibility. In addition, 51 percent had incomes below the 100 percent poverty level. Of the non-TANF families who had left Food Stamps, 61 percent had incomes below 130 percent of poverty when surveyed, and 42 percent had incomes below 100 percent of poverty.

How Many of the Families Who Are Still Eligible for Food Stamps Are Not Accessing Benefits Because of “Administrative Hassles”?

Another concern raised by the Urban Institute study was that many of the families who leave Food Stamps but are still eligible for benefits are not re-enrolling because of administrative “hassles.” The study found that 32 percent of non-TANF families who had left Food Stamps cited administrative hassles as the reason for not being on Food Stamps. By comparison, only 27 percent of welfare families who had left Food Stamps cited this as a reason for no longer being enrolled. According to the authors, this suggests that “families outside the cash assistance system are more likely to struggle with the program requirements for maintaining eligibility.”

The authors concluded that continued efforts should be made to cut down on paperwork and reporting requirements for recipients, and that there is a need for greater outreach to low-income families to improve participation rates in Food Stamps.

What Types of Non-Welfare Families Are Returning to Food Stamps and Why?

One of the objectives of the study was to determine which types of families are returning to Food Stamps (“recidivists”) and to compare them to families who stay off the rolls. A related objective of the study was to examine the barriers faced by the recidivists in leaving Food Stamps over the long term.

³ Zedlewski and Brauner: *Are the Steep Declines in Food Stamp Participation Linked to Falling Welfare Caseloads?*, Urban Institute, 1999.

How Do One-Parent and Two-Parent Families Compare in Terms of their Experiences After Leaving Food Stamps?

In designing the study of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers, SCDSS wished to focus on two specific sub-groups among the population: one-parent families and two-parent families. The survey sample, in fact, was stratified to include equal numbers of cases from these two groups.

In comparing one-parent and two-parent families, SCDSS wanted to be able to determine whether household composition had an impact on the experiences and well-being of non-welfare families after they left Food Stamps. It was assumed, for example, that two-parent families might fare better in terms of overall well-being because they potentially had access to the resources of two adults. One-parent families, therefore, were a focus of special concern to SCDSS in terms of their status after leaving Food Stamps. SCDSS also wished to know more about the different characteristics of one-parent v. two-parent families, including the reasons why they left Food Stamps and their barriers to self-sufficiency.

B. DATA COLLECTED AND ANALYZED FOR THE STUDY

Data for the study were collected through telephone interviews and through the analysis of administrative records data. The administrative records data were obtained from the SCDSS automated systems on all sample members. The administrative data are presented in Appendix B of the report.

C. SAMPLE DESIGN AND SAMPLE SELECTION

As noted above, the sample of Food Stamp leavers for the study actually consisted of two distinct samples:

- a sample of 644 families who left Food Stamps between October 1998 and March 1999 (Cohort One); and
- a sample of 644 families who left Food Stamps between October 1999 and March 2000 (Cohort Two).

The sample was selected from SCDSS's statewide administrative records system. Families had to have been off Food Stamps for at least two consecutive months to be counted as leavers. The samples consisted only of Food Stamp cases in which children were present in the case. In addition, none of the families in the two samples had been on TANF in the 12 months prior to leaving Food Stamps. The names in the sample consisted of the heads of household in each case, as designated by SCDSS. Surveys were conducted with the heads of households in each sample case.

The study was based on a stratified sample design in which one-parent and two-parent cases each comprised 50 percent of the sample. Exhibit I-1 provides an overview of the

stratified sample design for the study. In effect, two-parent cases were oversampled so that we would have enough of these cases to draw meaningful comparisons between one-parent and two-parent cases.

Because of the stratified sample design, sample weights were applied to the data when generating the tables for this report. *For this reason, there are tables in the report in which the sub-group sample sizes do not necessarily add up to the overall sample of cases.*

EXHIBIT I-1 OVERVIEW OF THE STRATIFIED SAMPLE

Strata	Cohort One	Cohort Two	Total
1-parent cases	322	322	644
2-parent cases	322	322	644
Total	644	644	1,288

D. SURVEY METHODS

The surveys were conducted by telephone from the MAXIMUS Survey Research Center, using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Contact information on the 644 families was obtained from the automated systems of the South Carolina Department of Social Services and was loaded onto the CATI system. In an effort to standardize the follow-up period, surveys were initially targeted to families who had left Food Stamps between October and December 1998. The surveys for this group were begun in October 1999. In January 2000, we began the process of surveying the families who had left Food Stamps between January and March 1999. A similar approach was used for Cohort Two.

The survey process began with an initial mail-out on SCDSS letterhead inviting sample members to call the toll-free numbers at the Survey Research Center. A financial incentive of \$20 was offered in this mail-out. A second round of mail-outs was initiated after a few weeks to persons who did not respond to the first mail-out. The incentive in the second mail-out was increased to \$25. During the mail-out process, MAXIMUS interviewers also made attempts to contact sample members using the telephone numbers provided by SCDSS. If the numbers turned out to be invalid, Directory Assistance calls were used. The CATI system was programmed to vary the times of callbacks to sample members and to record information on the results of all contact attempts.

In addition to the above procedures, we obtained a data match on the sample from a commercial data broker who provided credit bureau information and other contact information from public records. MAXIMUS also had a staff member on-site at one of the SCDSS District Offices searching the SCDSS databases for contact information on sample members who were still receiving any type of public assistance. SCDSS also provided a match of the sample against the file of custodial parents in the state's child support enforcement database.

Finally, we conducted field-based survey efforts to locate sample members in their neighborhoods and to encourage them to complete the survey. The field-based interviewers provided the sample members with cell phones to call the Survey Research Center’s toll-free number to complete the survey on the CATI system.

E. SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

Of the 644 persons in Cohort One, 2 were confirmed as deceased or incarcerated. Among the 642 sample members who were available to be interviewed, we completed surveys with 457 persons, representing a response rate of 71.2 percent.

Exhibit I-2 shows the response rates for Cohort One by the primary sampling strata. As shown in the exhibit, the response rate for one-parent cases was slightly higher than the response rate for two-parent cases. Exhibit I-3 shows the response rates for Cohort Two by primary sampling strata. As indicated, an adjusted response rate of 68.8 percent was achieved. The overall adjusted response rate for both samples combined was 70.0 percent.

**EXHIBIT I-2
RESPONSE RATES BY SAMPLING STRATA, COHORT ONE**

Strata	Sample Size	Available for Interview	Surveys Completed	Unadjusted Response Rate	Adjusted Response Rate
1-parent	322	320	233	72.4%	72.8%
2-parent	322	322	224	69.6%	69.6%
Total	644	642	457	71.0%	71.2%

**EXHIBIT I-3
RESPONSE RATES BY SAMPLING STRATA, COHORT TWO**

Strata	Sample Size	Available for Interview	Surveys Completed	Unadjusted Response Rate	Adjusted Response Rate
1-parent	322	322	218	67.7%	67.7%
2-parent	322	320	224	69.6%	70.8%
Total	644	642	442	68.6%	68.8%

Response Rates by Ethnicity and Gender

For Cohort One, the response rate among whites (66 percent) was lower than the response rates among blacks (78 percent). In addition, the response rate among females (70 percent) was lower than among males (81 percent). For Cohort Two, the response rate among

blacks and whites was about the same at 70 percent. The response rate was somewhat higher for females (69 percent) than for males (65 percent).

F. USE OF WEIGHTS IN THE DATA ANALYSIS

Weights were used in the data analysis because the study was based on a “nested stratified sample design” involving the two different strata. The main strata consisted of one-parent and two-parent households. The nested strata consisted of households with two children and all other households. The sample was selected so that each of the four cells contained an equal number of cases, even though the four types of cases were not equal in number in the overall population of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers. Under this design, some types of cases were over-sampled and some types of cases were under-sampled in relation to their actual numbers in the overall population.

When conducting the data analyses for the study, we calculated the totals for each major variable for all respondents combined. We also calculated separate results for one-parent cases and two-parent cases. In computing the separate results for the one-parent cases and two-parent cases, we applied two weights – one for the one-parent cases and another to the two-parent cases. These two weights were designed to correct for the fact that an equal number of one-parent and two parent cases had been selected for the sample, but there was not an equal number of one-parent and two-parent cases in the overall population.

When we calculated the *totals* for each variable, however, it was necessary to apply four different weights, not two. The four weights were designed to correct for *both* of the strata in the nested sample design. A separate weight had to be applied to each of the four cells in the sample to reflect the relationship between the cell size and the total number of cases of each type in the overall population. For example, the weight that was used for one-parent cases involving two children was based on the relationship between the number of these cases in the sample and the total number of these cases in the population of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers. A different weight was used for two-parent cases involving two children. Overall, a separate weight had to be used for each of the four cells in the sample.

For this reason, the weighted totals in the tables for many of the analyses are different from the combined totals for the one-parent and two-parent cases in the same tables.

G. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of the report presents the key findings from the surveys, as follows:

- Chapter II presents findings on respondent characteristics, and draws comparisons with families who left the TANF program in South Carolina. This chapter also presents an analysis of Food Stamp recidivism among the sample.

- Chapters III to VI present findings on families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. The specific topics covered in each chapter are as follows:
 - Chapter III presents findings on employment outcomes among families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys, including employment status, earnings, work hours, reasons for not working, work history, total household income, and poverty status.
 - Chapter IV presents the findings on indicators of family well-being among families still off Food Stamps, including adverse events, food security, and life after Food Stamps.
 - Chapter V presents the findings on child outcomes among families who were still off Food Stamps.
 - Chapter VI provides findings on the use of benefit programs and child care by families still off Food Stamps.

Appendix A of the report provides additional analysis of the findings on child outcomes. For the additional analysis, we constructed a “child outcomes index” that combines the results for the child outcome questions into a single numerical measure for each respondent. Appendix B of the report presents the analysis of data from the SCDSS administrative records.

CHAPTER II: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND RECIDIVISM

This chapter describes the basic characteristics of all the survey respondents, including their gender, ethnicity, education, and age. As indicated in Chapter I, the survey respondents consisted of the heads of household in the sample cases. The chapter also draws comparisons between the non-welfare leavers and a sample of TANF leavers in South Carolina.

In addition, the chapter presents an analysis of Food Stamp recidivism among the survey respondents. The recidivists are those who were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. These respondents were asked a series of questions about their reasons for going back on Food Stamps, their barriers to employment, and other issues. In this chapter, we compare the recidivists with the respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys.

A. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

This section presents information on the demographics of all survey respondents in the study. Comparisons are drawn between the one-parent and two-parent families in the sample.

Gender, Ethnicity, Education, and Age

Exhibit II-1 indicates that, in Cohort One, females accounted for more than 96 percent of the one-parent cases. In contrast, only 74.7 percent of the respondents from two-parent families were females. In Cohort Two, females accounted for almost 98 percent of the respondents from one-parent families, and 86 percent of the respondents from two-parent families.

In Cohort One, about 73 percent of all one-parent families were black, compared to only 42 percent of two-parent families. The same general pattern was true for the Cohort Two. In Cohort One, almost 33 percent of the respondents in two-parent cases had not completed high school or a GED, compared to about 27 percent of the respondents in one-parent cases. Similar results were found for the Cohort Two.

In Cohort One, almost one quarter (24.4 percent) of the respondents in two-parent cases were aged 40 or older, compared to 22 percent of the one-parent families. Overall, about 44 percent of the respondents were aged 35 or older. The data for Cohort Two show a different pattern. Only 32 percent of the respondents from one-parent families were aged 35 and over, compared to 45 percent in Cohort One. Only 33 percent of respondents in two-parent cases in Cohort Two were aged 35 and older, compared to 41 percent in Cohort One.

Education by Ethnicity

For Cohort One, Exhibit II-2 indicates that about one-third of white respondents had not completed high school, compared to one-quarter of blacks. The difference between blacks

and whites was even more pronounced in Cohort Two. About 40 percent of whites had not completed high school, compared to only 23 percent of blacks.

EXHIBIT II-1 GENDER, ETHNICITY, AND AGE OF ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS

	Cohort One		Cohort Two	
	One-Parent N=231	Two-Parent N=223	One-Parent N=219	Two-Parent N=223
Gender				
Female	96.4%	74.7%	97.9%	86.2%
Male	3.6%	25.3%	2.1%	13.8%
Ethnicity				
Black	72.9%	41.6%	72.5%	44.6%
White	26.2%	57.0%	26.8%	54.7%
Other	0.9%	1.5%	0.7%	0.7%
Education				
Did not complete high school/GED	26.9%	32.8%	28.3%	31.2%
Completed high school only	54.2%	48.7%	52.0%	50.1%
Attended college	18.9%	18.6%	19.7%	18.6%
Age				
18-24	10.0%	11.6%	22.4%	15.8%
25-29	22.4%	19.4%	22.7%	24.8%
30-34	22.8%	28.0%	22.7%	26.3%
35-39	23.0%	16.5%	17.8%	15.7%
40+	21.8%	24.4%	14.4%	17.4%

EXHIBIT II-2 EDUCATION LEVEL BY ETHNICITY – ALL RESPONDENTS

Education	Cohort One		
	Black	White	Other
N	261	188	5
Did not complete high school or GED	25.3%	33.6%	67.5%
Completed high school or GED only	55.1%	48.5%	32.5%
Attended college	19.6%	17.9%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Education	Cohort Two		
	Black	White	Other
N	282	154	2
Did not complete high school or GED	23.3%	40.2%	14.7%
Completed high school or GED only	56.0%	42.4%	85.3%
Attended college	20.7%	17.4%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Education by Age

For Cohort One, Exhibit II-3 indicates that younger respondents were generally less likely to have completed high school. Of the respondents aged 18-24, 39 percent had not completed high school, compared to only 22 percent of the respondents aged 35-39. The same general pattern was true for Cohort Two, except that the 40+ age group included a relatively large percentage of drop-outs.

EXHIBIT II-3 EDUCATION LEVEL BY AGE – ALL RESPONDENTS

	Cohort One				
Education	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	49	95	115	89	104
Did not complete high school or GED	39.0%	31.9%	28.8%	22.1%	24.8%
Completed high school or GED	48.3%	50.7%	54.4%	57.3%	51.2%
Attended college	12.8%	17.4%	16.8%	20.6%	24.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two				
Education	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	90	102	104	75	68
Did not complete high school or GED	36.4%	29.0%	24.1%	26.5%	30.7%
Completed high school or GED	51.4%	46.1%	53.8%	56.3%	50.5%
Attended college	12.2%	24.9%	22.1%	17.2%	18.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Age by Ethnicity

For Cohort One, Exhibit II-4 indicates that about one-quarter of the white respondents were aged 40 or older, compared to only 21 percent of the black respondents. However, 45 percent of the black respondents were aged 35 or older, compared to only 40 percent of white respondents. In Cohort Two, 23 percent of blacks were aged 18-24, compared to only 14 percent of whites.

**EXHIBIT II-4
AGE BY ETHNICITY – ALL RESPONDENTS**

	Cohort One		
Age	Black	White	Other
N	261	188	5
18-24	10.0%	11.7%	0.0%
25-29	23.0%	18.1%	59.3%
30-34	22.0%	29.2%	0.0%
35-39	24.1%	15.8%	14.9%
40+	21.0%	25.3%	25.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Age	Black	White	Other
N	282	154	2
18-24	23.2%	14.1%	85.3%
25-29	22.9%	24.3%	14.7%
30-34	22.3%	26.9%	0.0%
35-39	16.4%	18.9%	0.0%
40+	15.2%	15.8%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

B. COMPARISONS WITH WELFARE LEAVERS

This section compares the non-welfare Food Stamp leavers with a sample of families who left the South Carolina TANF program between 1998 and 1999.¹ The large majority of the TANF leavers were also Food Stamp recipients, so the comparison is useful as an indication of the differences between TANF and non-TANF families on Food Stamps. It should be noted, however, that many of the TANF leavers did not leave the Food Stamp program when they left TANF.

Comparisons by Education, Ethnicity, and Age

Exhibit II-5 summarizes the major differences between Cohort One and the TANF leavers. The data show that the TANF leavers were much more likely to have dropped out of high school (44.3 percent) than single-parent non-TANF Food Stamp leavers (26.9 percent) and two-parent non-TANF Food Stamp leavers (32.8 percent). A comparison between the TANF leavers and Cohort Two showed similar findings.

The data in Exhibit II-5 also show that single-parent non-TANF Food Stamp leavers were similar in ethnicity to TANF leavers, with more than 70 percent being black. In contrast, a majority of the two-parent non-TANF Food Stamp leavers were white. It should be noted that most of the TANF leavers were single parents.

¹ The sample of TANF leavers consists of 1,072 respondents who were interviewed by MAXIMUS as part of the South Carolina Welfare Leavers and Diverters Research Study

Finally, the TANF leavers were generally younger than the non-TANF Food Stamp leavers. About 20 percent of the TANF leavers were under 25, and 45 percent were under 30. In contrast, only 32 percent of the one-parent non-TANF cases were under 30, and only 31 percent of the two-parent non-TANF cases were under 30. In comparing the TANF leavers with Cohort Two, however, there was relatively little difference in terms of age distribution.

EXHIBIT II-5
COMPARISON OF NON-TANF FOOD STAMP FAMILIES IN COHORT ONE AND TANF LEAVERS, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Cohort One Single-Parent Families	Cohort One Two-Parent Families	TANF Families
<i>Education</i>			
Did not complete high school or GED	26.9%	32.8%	44.3%
Completed high school or GED only	54.2%	48.7%	40.1%
Attended college	18.9%	18.6%	15.5%
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
Black	72.9%	41.6%	78.3%
White	26.2%	57.0%	21.7%
<i>Age</i>			
18-24	10.0%	11.6%	20.2%
25-29	22.4%	19.4%	25.0%
30-34	22.8%	28.0%	19.8%
35-39	23.0%	16.5%	18.2%
40+	21.8%	24.4%	16.9%

Educational Differences Controlling for Age

To some extent, the lower educational levels among TANF leavers may reflect the fact that the TANF leavers were younger on average than the non-TANF Food Stamp leavers. To address this issue, we examined data on educational levels among the TANF and non-TANF leavers by age group. For Cohort One, we found that the TANF leavers had somewhat lower educational levels than the non-TANF Food Stamp leavers even when age was considered. Specifically, 49 percent of the 18-24 year old TANF leavers were high school drop-outs, compared to only 41 percent of the non-TANF single-parent cases, and 34 percent of the non-TANF two-parent cases. For Cohort Two, we found a similar overall pattern.

C. RECIDIVISM AMONG THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS

For purposes of this analysis, recidivists are respondents who reported that they were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. As indicated in Exhibit II-6, 116 respondents from Cohort One (25.8 percent) and 127 respondents from Cohort Two (28.7 percent) were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys.

Recidivism by Case Characteristics

Exhibit II-6 shows that, in Cohort One, 27.8 percent of the one-parent cases were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. By contrast, only 22.7 percent of the respondents in two-parent cases were back on Food Stamps when surveyed. In Cohort Two, the percentages were 33.7 percent and 23.9 percent, respectively.

In Cohort One, 28.4 percent of black respondents were back on Food Stamps when interviewed, compared to only 23.3 percent of white respondents. None of the respondents from other ethnic groups were back on Food Stamps. In Cohort Two, 33 percent of blacks were back on Food Stamps, compared to 26 percent of whites.

In Cohort One, almost 40 percent of the respondents who had not completed high school were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. In contrast, only 11 percent of those who had attended college, and 24 percent of those who had completed high school only, were back on Food Stamps. In Cohort Two, 41 percent of high school drop-outs were back on Food Stamps, compared to 25 percent of persons who had completed high school only, and 30 percent of those who had attended college.

In both cohorts, recidivism was much higher among younger respondents than older respondents.

**EXHIBIT II-6
FOOD STAMP STATUS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEYS – ALL
RESPONDENTS**

	Cohort One (n=450)	Cohort Two (n=445)
All respondents	25.8%	28.7%
<i>Case Type</i>		
One-parent	27.8%	33.7%*
Two-parent	22.7%	23.9%*
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Black	28.4%	33.3%
White	23.3%	26.4%
<i>Education</i>		
Did not complete high school	39.5%*	40.8%*
Completed high school only	24.4%*	25.4%*
Attended college	11.4%*	30.0%
<i>Age</i>		
18-24	35.5%*	37.6%*
25-29	37.9%*	34.0%*
30-34	25.2%	30.2%
35-39	22.5%	29.9%
40+	16.5%*	18.6%*

NOTES: (1) The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level. (2) In Cohort One, the difference between drop-outs and all other respondents was statistically significant, as was the difference between persons who had completed high school only and college attendees. (3) In Cohort Two, the difference between drop-outs and persons who had completed high school only was statistically significant. (4) The differences between 40+ persons and persons aged 18-24 and 25-29 were statistically significant.

Employment Status of Persons Back on Food Stamps

Exhibit II-7 shows that 43 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys were working for pay. Almost 48 percent of respondents from one-parent families were working, compared to 30.5 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. However, many of the respondents in two-parent cases may have had an employed spouse. Among Cohort Two, 43 percent of the persons who were back on Food Stamps were working for pay, including 44 percent of one-parent cases and 39 percent of two-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT II-7
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BACK ON
FOOD STAMPS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	Cohort One		
Employment Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	64	51	120
Working for pay	47.6%*	30.5%	43.2%
	Cohort Two		
Employment Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	73	53	135
Working for pay	43.9%*	39.4%	42.9%

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were statistically significant at the .05 level

Monthly Earnings Among Recidivists by Household Type

For persons who were employed at the time of the survey, Exhibit II-8 shows the monthly earnings reported by respondents. For Cohort One, median monthly earnings in one-parent cases were slightly higher (\$1,032) than in two-parent cases (\$947). Among Cohort Two, the difference was even greater, although median earnings were lower. In Cohort One, almost 55 percent of the employed respondents in one-parent families were earning more than \$1,000 per month, compared to only 34 percent for Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT II-8
MONTHLY EARNINGS OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS
BACK ON FOOD STAMPS**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Earnings	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	31	15	52
\$1-\$500	10.7%	0.0%	8.8%
\$501-\$750	10.7%	25.9%	13.5%
\$751-\$1,000	23.8%	29.3%	24.8%
\$1,001-\$1,250	28.6%	18.9%	26.8%
\$1,251-\$1,500	19.6%	4.7%	16.9%
\$1,500+	6.5%	21.1%	9.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$1,031.75	\$946.89	\$1,021.73
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Earnings	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	31	21	55
\$1-\$500	8.8%	27.8%	12.9%
\$501-\$750	25.1%	27.8%	25.7%
\$751-\$1,000	32.2%	9.6%	27.3%
\$1,001-\$1,250	12.9%	3.5%	10.8%
\$1,251-\$1,500	17.0%	15.7%	16.7%
\$1,500+	4.1%	15.7%	6.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$905.12	\$719.73	\$891.52

Work History of Unemployed Respondents

For persons who were back on Food Stamps and *not* working at the time of the surveys, Exhibit II-9 shows that almost 53 percent of Cohort One and 72 percent of Cohort Two had worked in the past 12 months. In Cohort One, about 62 percent of the unemployed persons in one-parent cases had worked in the past 12 months. For Cohort Two, the percentage was 81 percent.

**EXHIBIT II-9
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS BACK ON FOOD STAMPS - HAVE YOU
WORKED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS? -- BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	Cohort One		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	34	35	68
Worked in last 12 months	62.2%*	32.0%*	52.6%
	Cohort Two		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	41	32	78
Worked in last 12 months	81.1%*	45.8%*	72.4%

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were statistically significant at the .05 level

Unemployed Respondents – Reason for Not Working

For persons who were back on Food Stamps and *not* working at the time of the surveys, Exhibits II-10 and II-11 show the reasons given for not working. In Cohort One, about 37 percent of the one-parent cases had been laid off from a job, while almost 24 percent said that they could not find a job or a good-paying job. Among two-parent cases, the reason most often cited was health condition or injury (26.8 percent).

In Cohort Two, the two-parent cases were more likely than the one-parent cases to mention child care issues and preferring to stay home with children. The one-parent cases were more likely to mention not being able to find a good-paying job and being laid off or fired.

**EXHIBIT II-10
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS BACK ON FOOD STAMPS
-- REASONS NOT WORKING, COHORT ONE**

Reason not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	34	35	68
Laid off/fired/quit job	37.2%	11.3%	29.1%
Can't find a job/good paying job	23.7%	20.6%	22.8%
Physical/mental illness/injury (self)	14.1%	26.8%	18.1%
Lack child care	12.4%	16.5%	13.7%
Want to stay home with children	10.3%	13.4%	11.3%
No transportation	13.5%	5.7%	11.0%
Currently/recently pregnant	12.4%	7.2%	10.8%
Physical/mental illness/injury (other)	3.8%	9.8%	5.7%
Don't have skills/experience	0.0%	14.4%	4.6%
In full/part time education	0.0%	2.1%	0.7%

**EXHIBIT II-11
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS BACK ON FOOD STAMPS
-- REASONS NOT WORKING, COHORT TWO**

Reason not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	41	32	78
Laid off from job	27.8%	24.9%	27.1%
Can't find job	19.4%	23.2%	20.3%
Physical/mental illness/injury(self)	20.2%	17.0%	19.4%
Lack child care	14.1%	22.6%	16.1%
Can't find job that pays enough	17.2%	6.2%	14.5%
Have no transportation	13.2%	12.4%	13.0%
Want to stay home with children	6.2%	20.3%	9.6%
Fired from job	11.5%	0.0%	8.7%
Physical/mental illness/injury(other)	8.4%	8.5%	8.4%
Don't have skills/experience	7.9%	6.2%	7.5%
Quit job	4.8%	10.2%	6.1%
Currently or recently pregnant	4.8%	0.0%	3.7%
In job training	0.0%	6.2%	1.5%
In full/part time education	1.8%	0.0%	1.3%
Other	0.0%	3.9%	1.0%
Can't get to a job on time	0.0%	2.3%	0.6%

Reasons for Going Back on Food Stamps

For respondents who were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys, Exhibit II-12 shows the reasons given by respondents for going back on Food Stamps. As indicated, almost 28 percent of the Cohort One recidivists and 42 percent of the Cohort Two recidivists reported that they went back on Food Stamps because they had been laid off or fired from a job.

Almost 25 percent of the Cohort One recidivists and 23 percent of the Cohort Two recidivists mentioned that they had experienced a decrease in work hours or wages. The next most common reason cited by respondents was illness or disability (10.6 percent for Cohort One and 10.4 percent for Cohort Two), while another 5 percent of each sample mentioned the illness or disability of a family member.

EXHIBIT II-12 REASONS FOR GOING BACK ON FOOD STAMPS

Reasons for Going Back on Food Stamps	Cohort One			Cohort Two		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	64	51	120	73	53	135
Divorce/separation	4.0%	3.9%	4.0%	7.4%	10.3%	8.1%
Laid off from job or fired	27.2%	29.4%	27.8%	44.9%	31.9%	41.9%
Quit job	5.4%	5.0%	5.3%	9.9%	8.6%	9.6%
Decrease in hours worked or wages	23.8%	27.6%	24.8%	23.7%	20.5%	23.0%
Loss of health insurance	1.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Your illness/disability	11.0%	9.3%	10.6%	10.9%	8.9%	10.4%
Illness/disability of a family member	5.1%	6.8%	5.5%	4.7%	7.5%	5.4%
Housing problems	2.3%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%
Irregular child support payments	8.5%	5.0%	7.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Loss of financial support from relatives/friends	3.1%	3.9%	3.3%	1.7%	7.5%	3.1%
Loss of transportation	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.4%	1.8%
Child care problems	1.1%	0.0%	0.8%	3.5%	1.4%	3.0%
Spouse/partner did not want me to work	0.0%	2.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pregnancy	5.4%	5.0%	5.3%	4.4%	0.0%	3.4%
Change in household composition	2.0%	2.5%	2.1%	1.0%	4.8%	1.9%
Other	6.5%	2.5%	5.5%	6.9%	10.9%	7.8%

Barriers to Leaving Food Stamps

Respondents who were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys were asked to identify the major barriers being experienced in leaving Food Stamps. Respondents were asked the question in an open-ended format and were not read a list of barriers.

As indicated in Exhibit II-13, almost 49 percent of the recidivists in Cohort One and 51 percent of the recidivists in Cohort Two said that they could not find a job that pays enough. Almost 10 percent of the respondents mentioned illness or disability as a barrier to leaving Food Stamps. About 5 percent of the respondents pointed to child care problems.

EXHIBIT II-13 BARRIERS TO LEAVING FOOD STAMPS

Barriers to Leaving Food Stamps	Cohort One			Cohort Two		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	64	51	120	73	53	135
Lack of job skills	24.1%	25.8%	24.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lack of education	2.3%	15.4%	5.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%
Lack of reliable or affordable child care	6.2%	2.5%	5.3%	5.4%	5.1%	5.4%
Lack of transportation	2.0%	1.4%	1.8%	7.4%	5.1%	6.9%
Can't find job that pays enough	51.8%	39.4%	48.6%	50.1%	52.4%	50.6%
Can't find job with health insurance	0.0%	2.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Can't find job with regular hours/enough hours	19.2%	15.8%	18.3%	23.5%	19.2%	22.5%
Available jobs are short-term or seasonal	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	5.4%	4.8%	5.3%
Don't receive child support	4.3%	6.4%	4.8%	2.7%	0.0%	2.1%
Disability or illness	9.3%	10.8%	9.7%	10.6%	10.3%	10.5%
Disability/illness of a child or other family member	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%	6.4%	7.5%	6.7%
No barriers- prefer to stay at home with children	2.3%	3.9%	2.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%
No barriers- waiting to complete training/education	0.0%	5.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cannot make ends meet without Food Stamps	5.1%	8.9%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Spouse lost job	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	1.1%
Other	2.0%	2.9%	2.2%	3.5%	2.4%	3.2%

CHAPTER III: EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS, AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME AMONG RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on employment, work hours, earnings patterns, total household income, and poverty among respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys.¹

A. EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEYS

Employment Rates by Case Characteristics

Respondents to the survey were asked whether they were working for pay at the time of the interviews, including working for an employer or self-employment. As indicated in Exhibit III-1, 72 percent of Cohort One and 72.5 percent of Cohort Two were working for pay at the time of the surveys. Persons from one-parent families were much more likely to be working than persons from two-parent families. However, as noted later in the chapter, respondents from two-parent families were more likely to have a spouse or partner who was employed.

In both samples, black respondents were much more likely to be employed than white respondents. This was also true within the two major sampling strata. More educated respondents were more likely to be working than less educated respondents. The difference in employment status based on educational level was particularly evident among one-parent families. Among one-parent cases in Cohort One, 89 percent of college attendees were working, compared to only 58 percent of high school drop-outs. Among one-parent cases in Cohort Two, only 61 percent of drop-outs were working, compared to 92 percent of college attendees. Among Cohort Two, education had no impact upon employment rates in two-parent cases.

¹ In several of the tables in this chapter, the n's for the total column are different from the combined n's for one-parent and two-parent cases. The reason for this is explained in Chapter I, Section F of the report.

**EXHIBIT III-1
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT FOLLOW-UP –
PERCENT WORKING FOR PAY**

	Cohort One (n=337)	Cohort Two (n=303)
Overall sample	72.0%	72.5%
Case Type		
One-parent	77.6%*	77.8%*
Two-parent	60.6%*	61.6%*
Ethnicity		
Black	79.7%*	77.8%*
White	59.3%*	63.4%*
Education		
Did not complete high school	57.0%**	61.9%**
Completed high school only	74.1%	74.5%
Attended college	83.7%	80.3%**

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent cases and between blacks and whites were statistically significant at the .05 level in both cohorts

** The differences between drop-outs and others was statistically significant at the .05 level for Cohort 1. The difference between drop-outs and college attendees was statistically significant at the .05 level in Cohort Two

Length of Time in Current Job

Exhibit III-2 shows that 35 percent of employed respondents in Cohort One had been in their current job for one year or more, and 63 percent had been in their job for six months or more. Among Cohort Two, 66 percent of the employed respondents had been in their current job for one year or more.

**EXHIBIT III-2
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS -- LENGTH OF TIME
IN CURRENT JOB**

Time in Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
One month or less	10.7%	7.0%
More than 1 month but less than 6 months	26.8%	13.2%
More than 6 months but less than 12 months	27.4%	13.8%
12 months or more	35.1%	66.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%
Median months	12.0	12.0

B. TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY RESPONDENTS

Information on the types of jobs obtained by Food Stamp leavers is potentially useful to state and local policymakers in designing job placement and job development programs for Food Stamp recipients. Research has shown that certain types of occupations are preferable to others on a number of key indicators, including wages, health benefits, employment stability, opportunities for advancement, job satisfaction, and the need to work non-traditional hours. Ideally, steps should be taken by state and local program managers to help direct Food Stamp recipients into jobs that have the greatest prospects for long-term employment stability.

Types of Occupations

Exhibit III-3 shows that, overall, the most common occupations among employed respondents were assembly/production/packer (23.6 percent of employed respondents in Cohort One and 28.7 percent of employed respondents in Cohort Two).

**EXHIBIT III-3
TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY CURRENTLY EMPLOYED
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Assembly/production/packing	23.6%	28.7%
Cashier/sales clerk	12.4%	8.0%
Office/clerical	12.1%	14.6%
Nurse's aide	9.8%	8.7%
Housekeeper/janitor	9.1%	6.7%
Restaurant worker/kitchen helper	8.2%	13.5%
Teacher's aide	4.0%	0.7%
“Other professional”	8.0%	4.8%
Trades/construction	5.0%	2.1%
Bus driver	2.5%	4.1%
Child care	1.8%	1.5%
“Other services”	1.5%	6.6%

Types of Employers

Exhibit III-4 indicates that, overall, almost 22 percent of the employed respondents from Cohort One and 29 percent of the employed respondents from Cohort Two were working for factories or for other manufacturing employers.

**EXHIBIT III-4
TYPES OF EMPLOYERS FOR WHOM RESPONDENTS WERE
WORKING, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Employer	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Factory/manufacturing	21.7%	28.7%
Retail/grocery	17.2%	8.6%
Hospital/health care facility	13.2%	15.7%
Professional services firm	11.4%	12.0%
Restaurant	10.2%	14.9%
School/college	7.5%	6.6%
“Other services”	7.3%	6.5%
Government agency	4.4%	4.0%
Construction	2.1%	0.7%
Farm	1.3%	0.0%
Self-employed	1.1%	2.2%

C. WORK HOURS AND NON-TRADITIONAL SCHEDULES

Hours Worked Per Week

Most of the employed respondents were working full-time or almost full-time. Exhibit III-5 shows that about 65 percent of the employed respondents in both cohorts were working 40+ hours per week. In a separate analysis, we found that that 88 percent of the employed persons in Cohort One and 86 percent of the employed persons in Cohort Two were working 30 or more hours per week. In both cohorts, respondents worked an average of 37 hours per week. In a separate analysis, it was found that only 4 percent of Cohort One and 5 percent of Cohort Two were working less than 20 hours per week.

In Cohort One, hours worked per week by employed respondents did not vary greatly by ethnicity. In Cohort Two, however, employed blacks were much more likely than employed whites to be working 40 or more hours per week.

In Cohort One, hours worked per week did not vary greatly by education of the respondent. Respondents who had not attended college were slightly more likely to be working full-time. In Cohort Two, however, the more educated respondents were working more hours.

**EXHIBIT III-5
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS
STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT FOLLOW-UP**

	Cohort One (n=243)		Cohort Two (n=219)	
	Average Hours per Week	Percent Working 40+ Hours	Average Hours per Week	Percent Working 40+ Hours
Overall sample	37.0	64.5%	36.6	65.4%
<i>Case Type</i>				
One-parent	38.0	66.8%	36.8	69.3%*
Two-parent	35.5	58.2%	36.1	55.2%*
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Black	37.9	64.4%	37.9	71.3%
White	38.3	65.2%	33.9	54.0%
<i>Education</i>				
Did not complete high school	38.2	68.1%	33.6*	51.5%
Completed high school only	36.6	64.4%	37.7*	70.5%
Attended college	36.8	62.2%	36.6	65.7%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level. The difference between high school drop-outs and those who had completed high school only was statistically significant at the .05 level

Non-Traditional Daily Work Schedules

Having to work evenings, nights, or weekends can create problems for families in such areas as child care and transportation. Exhibit III-6 indicates that almost 35 percent of the employed leavers in Cohort One and 30 percent of employed leavers in Cohort Two were working evening hours or night shifts. For the most part, those who worked non-traditional schedules were working in the evenings.

**EXHIBIT III-6
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO WORKED NON-
TRADITIONAL DAILY WORK SCHEDULES, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Work Hours	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m.	11.3%	8.8%
Usually end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	31.3%	25.2%
Usually begin work 4 p.m. to 5 a.m. or end work 6 p.m. to 8 a.m.	34.6%	29.8%

Working on Weekends

Exhibit III-7 indicates that 44 percent of all employed respondents from Cohort One and 51 percent of employed respondents from Cohort Two worked all or most weekends.

**EXHIBIT III-7
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO WORKED
WEEKENDS (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Weekend Hours	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Work every weekend	14.1%	21.5%
Work most weekends	30.4%	29.7%
Occasionally work weekends	22.2%	6.5%
Rarely/never work weekends	33.2%	42.3%
TOTAL.	100.0%	100.0%

D. EARNINGS PATTERNS

Earnings by Household Type

For employed respondents, Exhibit III-8 shows monthly earnings by type of household. The data indicate that employed respondents from one-parent families had higher median earnings per month than employed respondents from two-parent families. However, the differences were not statistically significant. Overall, one-third of the employed respondents from Cohort One were earning \$1,500 per month or more, and 73.4 percent were earning more than \$1,000 per month. Of the employed respondents from Cohort Two, 28 percent were earning \$1,500 or more, and 71 percent were earning more than \$1,000 per month.

Statewide data for 2000 show that the average monthly earnings of employed workers in South Carolina were about \$2,345, based on the UI wage reporting system. Most of the survey respondents, therefore, were earning much less than the statewide average. This is because most were working in low-skilled occupations. Despite this fact, most employed leavers were financially better off than when they were on Food Stamps, especially since none of them had been receiving TANF benefits.

**EXHIBIT III-8
MONTHLY EARNINGS AMONG EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Monthly Earnings	Cohort One		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	124	96	220*
\$1 - \$500	2.2%	8.5%	3.8%
\$501 - \$750	6.6%	13.6%	8.4%
\$751 - \$1,000	15.6%	11.2%	14.4%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	17.5%	19.7%	18.0%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	24.4%	15.7%	22.2%
\$1,500 +	33.8%	31.4%	33.2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,301	\$1,191	\$1,299
Monthly Earnings	Cohort Two		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	100	96	197*
\$1 - \$500	6.8%	9.2%	7.4%
\$501 - \$750	4.0%	9.0%	5.4%
\$751 - \$1,000	16.6%	13.8%	15.8%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	16.4%	23.9%	18.6%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	25.9%	21.8%	24.7%
\$1,500 +	30.3%	22.4%	28.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,299	\$1,201	\$1,264

* Persons who did not report their earnings were excluded from the analysis
The differences between one-parent and two-parent cases were **not** statistically significant at the .05 level

Impact of Education and Ethnicity on Earnings

With regard to education, median monthly earnings in Cohort One were somewhat higher among respondents with more education. Among employed respondents in Cohort Two, education had an even greater impact upon earnings – persons who had attended college were earning 30 percent more on average than persons who had dropped out of high school. With regard to ethnicity, median monthly earnings among Cohort One were higher among whites (\$1,386) than blacks (\$1,273). In Cohort Two, however, blacks were earning more than whites.

Hourly Wage Rates

Exhibit III-9 shows that almost 59 percent of all employed respondents in Cohort One were earning \$7.00 per hour or more, and that the median hourly wage was \$7.50. Only one-in-six of the respondents from one-parent families were earning less than \$6 per hour,

compared to one-quarter of the respondents from two-parent families. In Cohort Two, 71 percent were earning \$7 per hour or more, and the median hourly wage was almost \$8 per hour.

**EXHIBIT III-9
HOURLY WAGE RATES OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS IN
PRIMARY JOB, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Hourly Wages	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	124	96	220*
Less than \$6.00	16.6%	25.4%	20.5%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	20.0%	20.7%	20.3%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	23.4%	13.9%	19.2%
\$8.00 - \$8.99	15.7%	12.0%	14.1%
\$9.00 - \$9.99	11.2%	12.0%	11.5%
\$10.00+	13.2%	15.9%	14.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$7.63	\$7.49	\$7.50
	Cohort Two		
Hourly Wages	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	100	96	197*
Less than \$6.00	13.3%	16.8%	14.3%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	13.0%	17.4%	14.2%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	20.8%	22.7%	21.3%
\$8.00 - \$8.99	25.4%	23.1%	24.7%
\$9.00 - \$9.99	6.2%	7.1%	6.5%
\$10.00+	21.3%	12.8%	18.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$8.00	\$7.47	\$7.96

* Persons who did not report their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Earnings by Occupation

Exhibit III-10 indicates that median monthly earnings varied greatly by occupation. The occupations with the highest monthly earnings included “nurse, teacher, and other professionals,” assembly/production, office/clerical, and trades/construction. The occupations with the lowest monthly earnings were child care, restaurant worker, cashier/sales clerk, and housekeeper/janitor.

**EXHIBIT III-10
MEDIAN MONTHLY EARNINGS OF EMPLOYED
RESPONDENTS, BY PRIMARY OCCUPATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
Assembly/production/packing	\$1,390	\$1,420
Cashier/sales	\$955	\$1,092
Office/clerical	\$1,387	\$1,534
Nurse's aide	\$1,115	\$1,343
Housekeeping/janitor	\$958	\$770
Restaurant worker	\$1,069	\$953
Teacher's aide	\$892	\$1,269
Nurse, teacher, other professional	\$1,412	\$1,830
Trade/construction	\$1,212	\$1,386
Bus driver	\$1,001	\$1,169
Child care	\$628	\$1,010
Other services	\$1,136	\$957

Hourly Wages by Occupation

Exhibit III-11 shows that hourly earnings varied substantially by occupation, with the highest being trades/construction, “nurse, teacher, and other professional,” “other services,” assembly/production, and office/clerical. The occupations with the lowest hourly average wage were babysitter, teacher’s aide, housekeeper, cashier/sales clerk, and restaurant worker/kitchen helper.

**EXHIBIT III-11
MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS,
BY PRIMARY OCCUPATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
Assembly/production/packing	\$8.05	\$8.00
Cashier/sales	\$6.50	\$7.10
Office/clerical	\$8.00	\$8.79
Nurse's aide	\$7.35	\$8.00
Housekeeping/janitor	\$6.15	\$7.00
Restaurant worker	\$6.50	\$6.71
Teacher's aide	\$5.93	\$7.62
Nurse, teacher, other professional	\$8.78	\$11.25
Trade/construction	\$9.30	\$8.00
Bus driver	\$7.25	\$9.34
Child care	\$5.39	\$5.83
Other services	\$8.53	\$6.41

E. RESPONDENTS NOT CURRENTLY WORKING

This section presents findings on respondents who were still off Food Stamps when interviewed but who were not working for pay.

Reasons for Not Working

Exhibits III-11 and III-12 show the reasons given by unemployed respondents for not working. The most common reason – cited by about one-third of all unemployed persons in Cohort One and 31 percent of unemployed persons in Cohort Two – was physical or mental illness. In Cohort one, this was mentioned by 37.1 percent of the respondents from one-parent families.

Among Cohort One, the next most common reason was “want to stay home with children.” However, only 9 percent of the respondents from one-parent families mentioned this as a reason, compared to 24 percent of respondents from two-parent families. The data suggest that persons from two-parent families were more likely to be staying out of the labor force voluntarily because they had a spouse or partner who had income. Similar patterns were found for Cohort Two.

In Cohort One, respondents from two-parent families were much more likely than respondents from one-parent families to cite the physical or mental illness of a family member as a reason for not working. In Cohort Two, there was little difference between the two types of cases. Almost 11 percent of the respondents in the two cohorts mentioned child care problems as a reason for not working.

**EXHIBIT III-11
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS
– REASONS NOT WORKING NOW,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE, COHORT ONE**

Reason Not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	37	68	105
Physical/mental illness/injury (self)	37.1%	31.8%	33.6%
Want to stay home with children	8.8%	24.3%	18.8%
Laid off/fired/quit job	17.1%	16.1%	16.5%
Can't find job/good paying job	10.7%	11.8%	11.4%
Lack child care	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%
Physical/mental illness/injury (other person)	3.4%	9.6%	7.4%
In full/part time education	5.4%	8.0%	7.1%
Currently or recently pregnant	5.4%	4.0%	4.5%
Have no transportation	7.3%	2.2%	4.0%
Other	6.8%	1.1%	3.1%

**EXHIBIT III-12
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS
– REASONS NOT WORKING NOW,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE, COHORT TWO**

Reason Not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	32	65	84
Physical/mental illness/injury(self)	31.1%	31.1%	31.1%
Laid off from job	24.9%	12.3%	19.1%
Want to stay home with children	6.2%	26.9%	15.6%
Can't find job	14.7%	9.2%	12.2%
Physical/mental illness/injury (family member)	12.4%	10.4%	11.5%
Have no transportation	13.0%	8.4%	10.9%
Lack child care	6.2%	16.5%	10.9%
Don't have skills/experience	12.4%	5.3%	9.2%
In full/part time education	7.9%	8.4%	8.1%
Currently or recently pregnant	6.2%	8.4%	7.2%
Fired from job	9.1%	4.2%	6.9%
Can't find job that pays enough	8.5%	4.2%	6.5%
Quit job	6.2%	5.3%	5.8%
Lose benefits if working	2.3%	7.0%	4.4%
In job training	4.5%	3.1%	3.9%
Can't get to a job on time	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
Too old to work	3.9%	0.0%	2.1%

Work History

For Cohort One, Exhibit III-13 indicates that 31 percent of the persons who were not working at the time of the survey had worked at some time in the previous 12 months, while 69 percent had not. In Cohort Two, almost 53 percent of the currently unemployed respondents had worked in the past year, including almost 59 percent of the one-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT III-13
PERCENTAGE OF UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO HAD
WORKED FOR PAY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Household Type	Cohort One	Cohort Two
1-parent (N = 37)	32.7%	58.8%
2-parent (N = 68)	29.7%	45.1%
TOTAL (N = 105)	30.8%	52.6%

Work Hours and Non-Traditional Work Schedules in the Most Recent Job

Of the unemployed respondents who had worked in the past 12 months, 66 percent of the persons in Cohort One and 81 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had worked 40 or more hours per week in their last jobs. Almost 40 percent of persons in Cohort One and 50 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had worked early morning or evening hours.

Earnings in Previous Job

Of the unemployed respondents who had worked in the past 12 months, 50 percent of the persons in Cohort One and 86 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had been earning \$1,000 or more per month in their previous jobs. Among Cohort One, median monthly earnings did not vary greatly between one-parent and two-parent cases. Among Cohort Two, median earnings were much higher among one-parent cases.

F. PRESENCE OF OTHER EMPLOYED ADULTS – CASES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

Presence of Other Adults in the Household

Exhibit III-14 shows that almost 53 percent of Cohort One respondents and 47 percent of Cohort Two respondents were living with at least one other adult at the time of follow-up. Among the families that were two-parent cases when they left Food Stamps, only 82 percent of Cohort One and 71 percent of Cohort Two were still living with another adult at the time of the surveys one year later.

As shown in Exhibit III-15, almost 37 percent of Cohort One and 30 percent of Cohort Two were living with a spouse or partner at the time of the surveys. Among two-parent cases, only 77 percent of the Cohort One and 68 percent of Cohort Two were still living with a spouse or partner at the time of the surveys.

**EXHIBIT III-14
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH OTHER ADULTS AT THE
TIME OF THE SURVEYS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)***

	Cohort One		
Number of Other Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
None	61.1% **	17.5% **	47.4%
One or more	38.9%	82.5%	52.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of Other Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
None	65.1% **	29.2% **	53.4%
One or more	34.9%	70.8%	46.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The one-parent v. two-parent status of respondents refers to their status when they left Food Stamps. Data on the presence of other adults are from the surveys conducted one year later

**The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

**EXHIBIT III-15
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH A SPOUSE OR PARTNER,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Sample	1-parent	2-parent	Total
Cohort One	18.4%	76.9%	36.8%
Cohort Two	11.5%	68.1%	30.0%

Employment of Spouse/Partner

Exhibit III-16 shows that 26 percent of Cohort One and 24 percent of Cohort Two were living with an employed spouse or partner at the time of the surveys. Among the two-parent cases, about 53 percent of Cohort One and 51 percent of Cohort Two were living with an employed spouse or partner at the time of the surveys.

**EXHIBIT III-16
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH AN EMPLOYED SPOUSE
OR PARTNER, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Not living with spouse or partner	81.6%*	23.1%*	63.2%
Spouse/partner present and employed	14.0%	53.1%	26.3%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	4.4%	23.8%	10.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Not living with spouse or partner	88.5%*	31.9%*	70.0%
Spouse/partner present and employed	11.5%	50.8%	24.4%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	0.0%	17.3%	5.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Spouse/Partner

Exhibit III-17 combines the data on the respondent’s employment situation and the employment of the spouse/partner to highlight the respondent’s overall situation. In Cohort One, 82 percent of the respondents from one-parent families were either employed or living with an employed spouse or partner. About 85 percent of the respondents from two-parent families were either employed or living with an employed spouse or partner. The comparable figures for Cohort Two were 82 percent and 86 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-17
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSE/PARTNER,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Status	Cohort One		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Respondent currently employed	77.6%	60.6%	72.0%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	4.4%	24.5%	10.8%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed spouse/partner	18.0%	14.8%	17.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Status	Cohort Two		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Respondent currently employed	77.8%	61.6%	72.5%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	3.8%	24.3%	10.5%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed spouse/partner	18.4%	14.1%	17.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Adult

Exhibit III-18 combines the data on the respondent’s employment situation and the employment of any other adult in the household, including a spouse/partner or any unrelated adult. In Cohort One, 84 percent of the respondents from one-parent families were either employed or living with an employed adult, as were 85 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. The corresponding percentages for Cohort Two were 83 percent and 86 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-18
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND OTHER ADULTS, BY
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Respondent currently employed	77.6%	60.6%	72.0%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed adult	6.0%	24.5%	11.8%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed adult	16.4%	14.8%	15.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Respondent currently employed	77.8%	61.6%	72.5%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed adult	5.7%	24.7%	11.9%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed adult	16.6%	13.7%	15.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Work History of Unemployed Spouses/Partners

In separate analyses, it was found that about 71 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were living with an unemployed spouse or partner indicated that their spouse or partner had worked in the last 12 months. However, the figure for Cohort Two was only 37 percent. About 24 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported that their spouse or partner was not working indicated that physical or mental illness of the spouse/partner was the reason for being unemployed. For Cohort Two, the figure was 42 percent.

Work Hours of Employed Spouses/Partners

As shown in Exhibit III-19, almost 85 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had an employed spouse or partner reported that their spouse or partner was working 40 hours or more per week. For Cohort Two, the figure was 87 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-19
RESPONDENTS WITH EMPLOYED SPOUSES OR PARTNERS --
TOTAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY SPOUSE/PARTNER
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Hours Per Week	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	88	74
40+	84.7%	87.4%
30-39	7.9%	8.3%
20-29	4.4%	4.3%
1-19	3.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Earnings of Employed Spouses or Partners

As shown in Exhibit III-20, about 43 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had an employed spouse or partner reported that the spouse or partner earned \$1,500 or more per month. In separate analyses adjusting for persons who did not report earnings of the spouse or partner, the percentage was 64 percent. The adjusted figure for Cohort Two was 63 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-20
RESPONDENTS WITH EMPLOYED SPOUSES OR PARTNERS --
TOTAL MONTHLY EARNINGS OF SPOUSE/PARTNER
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Monthly Earnings	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	88	74
\$1-\$500	1.4%	0.6%
\$501-\$1,000	4.9%	2.8%
\$1,001-1250	5.2%	9.0%
\$1,251-\$1,500	11.8%	11.1%
\$1,500+	43.1%	40.9%
Not reported	32.6%	35.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,652	\$1,604

G. TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Respondents were asked “About how much money do you have coming into the household each month, including everyone’s earnings, as well as child support, unemployment benefits, and SSI, but not including cash assistance or Food Stamps?”

Total Household Income by Household Type

As shown in Exhibit III-21, 1.6 percent of the Cohort One respondents reported no income coming into the household and another 9.1 percent refused to answer the question or said that they did not know. In Cohort Two, 5.2 percent reported no income, and another 7.4 percent said they did not know or refused to answer. About 6.4 percent of Cohort One and 11 percent of Cohort Two reported monthly household income of less than \$500 per month. Almost 70 percent of Cohort One and 56 percent of Cohort Two reported household income of more than \$1,000 per month. In both cohorts, two-parent cases had higher monthly incomes on average than one-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT III-21
TOTAL MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Income	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	164	173	334
None	1.2%	2.3%	1.6%
\$1-\$499	5.2%	3.9%	4.8%
\$500-\$999	15.1%	14.2%	14.8%
\$1,000-\$1,499	29.7%	22.1%	27.3%
\$1,500+	37.8%*	52.4%*	42.4%
Don't know/refused	11.0%	5.1%	9.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,411	\$1,550	\$1,457
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Income	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	146	167	304
None	6.0%	3.6%	5.2%
\$1-\$499	5.9%	5.6%	5.8%
\$500-\$999	27.0%	22.7%	25.6%
\$1,000-\$1,499	32.1%	31.2%	31.8%
\$1,500+	21.1%	28.5%	24.2%
Don't know/refused	6.9%	8.4%	7.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,131	\$1,250	\$1,169

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Total Household Income by Education and Ethnicity

Exhibit III-22 indicates that household income varied by education. Of the Cohort One respondents who had not completed high school, 25 percent reported household income of less than \$1,000 per month, compared to 21 percent of those who had completed high school only, and 17 percent of those who had attended college. The corresponding figures for Cohort Two were 51 percent, 33 percent, and 30 percent. In a separate analysis, it was found that average monthly household income was somewhat higher for whites than blacks: \$1,567 v. \$1,370 in Cohort One and \$1,214 v. \$1,146 in Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT III-22
TOTAL MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY EDUCATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Income	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School or GED Only	Attended College
N	79	180	74
None	1.0%	2.0%	1.2%
\$1-\$499	9.5%	3.3%	3.3%
\$500-\$999	14.9%	15.8%	12.2%
\$1,000-\$1,499	27.9%	23.9%	35.1%
\$1,500+	37.7%	44.3%	42.8%
Don't know/refused	9.0%	10.7%	5.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,395	\$1,469	\$1,493
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Income	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School or GED Only	Attended College
N	76	149	59
None	9.4%	3.9%	3.7%
\$1-\$499	8.2%	4.6%	6.2%
\$500-\$999	33.1%	24.2%	19.9%
\$1,000-\$1,499	19.3%	36.6%	34.1%
\$1,500+	21.5%	25.2%	24.6%
Don't know/refused	8.5%	5.5%	11.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,024	\$1,211	\$1,233

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Household Type

Respondents were asked to identify the primary sources of income for their households. Respondents could identify more than one source. Exhibit III-23 indicates that 86 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported any household income cited their job as a primary

source of income. The percentage did not vary greatly by type of household. The figure for Cohort Two was 88 percent.

In Cohort One, 28 percent of the respondents from one-parent families identified child support as a primary source of income. The figure for Cohort Two was 29 percent. About 14 percent of Cohort One and almost 19 percent of Cohort Two identified SSI or Social Security as a primary source of income.

EXHIBIT III-23
PRIMARY SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Primary Source	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	142	157	293
Earnings from a job	84.6%	88.8%	86.0%
Child support	28.4%	12.1%	23.1%
SSI or Social Security	14.2%	14.0%	14.1%
Unemployment benefits	0.5%	2.5%	1.2%
Help with utilities	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Help from friends or family	3.6%	2.5%	3.2%
Workers compensation	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
	Cohort Two		
Primary Source	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	126	148	264
Earnings from a job	86.7%	90.3%	87.9%
Child support	29.0%	15.2%	24.5%
SSI or Social Security	17.7%	20.8%	18.7%
Unemployment benefits	3.2%	1.4%	2.6%
Help with utilities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	0.6%	2.2%	1.1%
Workers compensation	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%
Other	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Education

Exhibit III-24 indicates that respondents with more education were more likely to identify earnings from a job as a primary source of income. Respondents who had attended college were less likely to identify SSI or Social Security as a source of income than less educated respondents. In Cohort Two, the more educated were more likely to identify child support as a source of income.

**EXHIBIT III-24
PRIMARY SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME, BY EDUCATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Primary Source	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	69	155	70
Earnings from a job	77.9%	86.6%	92.8%
Child support	22.6%	24.1%	21.3%
SSI or Social Security	14.5%	16.6%	8.3%
Unemployment benefits	1.1%	1.7%	0.0%
Other	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Help with utilities	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	5.1%	3.6%	0.6%
Workers compensation	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	Cohort Two		
Primary Source	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	62	152	50
Earnings from a job	79.6%	88.0%	97.7%
Child support	18.3%	23.4%	35.4%
SSI or Social Security	24.6%	18.2%	13.2%
Unemployment benefits	0.7%	4.2%	0.0%
Other	4.5%	0.5%	0.0%
Help with utilities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%
Workers compensation	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Ethnicity

In Cohort One, there was not a great difference between blacks and whites in terms of primary sources of household income. In Cohort Two, whites (23 percent) were more likely than blacks (16 percent) to identify SSI or Social Security as a source of income.

H. POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This section examines the poverty status of families who were still off Food Stamps, based on reported earnings and household income. Two separate analyses are presented:

- an analysis based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouse/partners, counting the respondents, the spouse/partner, and all children in the calculation of family size;

- an analysis based on total household income reported by respondents, factoring in all adults and children in the calculation of family size.

Normally, only the second analysis would be used in a poverty analysis. However, we decided to use both approaches because of concerns about the limitations of the reported data on household income. One of these limitations is that the respondents may not know the exact incomes of other members of the household, especially in the case of unrelated adults. A second limitation is that household income may be under-reported out of privacy concerns. In fact, about 9 percent of Cohort One and 7 percent of Cohort Two refused to provide any information on household income.

A third limitation of the household income data is that respondents were allowed to report their total household income within broad ranges rather than being asked to give a specific dollar amount. This approach was designed to encourage respondents to report their household income and to avoid having to make complicated calculations in cases where the household had multiple sources of income. The income ranges were those shown above in the section on household income.

1. POVERTY ANALYSIS BASED ON REPORTED EARNINGS

The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of families based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouses/partners. The analysis is based on the federal poverty guidelines. Family size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, and the spouse/partner if present.²

Poverty Status by Household Type

As shown in Exhibit III-25, almost 38 percent of Cohort One and 34 percent of Cohort Two had earnings that placed them at 130 percent of poverty or higher. The data suggest, therefore, that 62 percent of Cohort One and 66 percent of Cohort Two might meet the gross income test for Food Stamps based solely on the earnings of respondents and their spouses/partners. One-parent families were somewhat more likely than two-parent families to have incomes at 130 percent of poverty or higher.

Overall, the data show that about 44 percent of Cohort One and 48 percent of Cohort Two had incomes below the poverty level. The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples in terms of the percent living below poverty was not statistically significant at the .05 level for either Cohort One or Cohort Two.

² In several of the tables in this section, the n's for the total column are different from the combined n's for the one-parent cases and two-parent cases. This is because of the use of sample weights and a nested sample design. The reason for the different n sizes is explained in further detail in Chapter I, Section F of the report.

**EXHIBIT III-25
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	161	166	325**
0 percent	14.8%	14.9%	14.8%
1-49 percent	3.4%	10.8%	5.7%
50-99 percent	24.7%	20.0%	23.3%
Percent below poverty	42.9%*	45.7%*	43.8%
100-129 percent	17.5%	19.1%	18.0%
130 percent or higher	39.6%	35.1%	38.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	132	160	280**
0 percent	21.2%	20.5%	21.0%
1-49 percent	6.1%	5.0%	5.7%
50-99 percent	21.0%	25.3%	22.4%
Percent below poverty	48.3%*	50.8%*	48.4%
100-129 percent	16.6%	18.7%	17.3%
130 percent or higher	35.2%	30.5%	33.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was **not** statistically significant at the .05 level

** Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Poverty Status by Education

As indicated in Exhibit III-26, almost 45 percent of the Cohort One families headed by respondents who had attended college had earnings that placed them at or above 130 percent of poverty. The comparable figure for families headed by high school drop-outs was only 32 percent. The corresponding figures for Cohort Two were 35 percent and 25 percent.

Almost 54 percent of the Cohort One families headed by high school drop-outs had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level, compared to only 35 percent of families headed by a respondent who had attended college. The figures for Cohort Two were 64 percent and 41 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-26
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY EDUCATION OF THE RESPONDENT**

	Cohort One*		
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	78	174	73
0 percent	21.1%	15.8%	5.7%
1-49 percent	11.1%	4.4%	3.1%
50-99 percent	22.1%	22.4%	26.5%
Percent below poverty	54.3%**	42.6%	35.3%**
100-129 percent	13.7%	19.1%	20.0%
130 percent or higher	32.0%	38.3%	44.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*		
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	73	156	51
0 percent	30.3%	19.1%	13.3%
1-49 percent	9.9%	4.9%	2.0%
50-99 percent	24.3%	20.4%	26.0%
Percent below poverty	64.5%***	44.4%***	41.3%***
100-129 percent	10.4%	18.5%	23.6%
130 percent or higher	25.1%	37.1%	35.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

**The difference between high school drop-outs and college attendees was statistically significant at the .05 level

***The difference between high school drop-outs and all other respondents was statistically significant at the .05 level

Poverty Status by Ethnicity

About 46 percent of the Cohort One families headed by blacks had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level -- the same as for families headed by whites. In Cohort Two, however, whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to be living in poverty. None of the differences was statistically significant.

Poverty Status by Age Group

Exhibit III-27 shows that only 26 percent of Cohort One families headed by a person aged 40 or older had earnings that placed them at or above 130 percent of the poverty level. In contrast, almost 53 percent of families headed by respondents aged 25-29 had earnings at or above 130 percent of poverty.

In Cohort Two, persons aged 18-24 were the most likely to be at 130 percent of poverty or higher. In both samples, the percent of families with earnings below the 100 percent poverty level generally increased with the age of the respondent.

EXHIBIT III-27
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY AGE OF THE RESPONDENT

	Cohort One*				
Percent of Poverty	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	31	60	83	70	79
0 percent	6.6%	4.9%	13.3%	6.3%	34.0%
1-49 percent	8.7%	2.6%	5.6%	8.5%	4.7%
50-99 percent	17.1%	23.3%	29.9%	24.7%	18.2%
Percent below poverty	32.4%	30.8%	48.8%	39.5%	56.9%
100-129 percent	28.0%	15.9%	16.2%	18.3%	17.2%
130 percent or higher	39.6%	53.4%	35.0%	39.1%	25.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*				
Percent of Poverty	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	54	63	69	44	49
0 percent	22.6%	14.7%	14.9%	27.9%	29.7%
1-49 percent	2.1%	6.4%	3.6%	9.9%	8.0%
50-99 percent	14.4%	24.7%	34.5%	17.2%	12.8%
Percent below poverty	39.1%	45.8%	53.0%	55.0%	50.5%
100-129 percent	10.3%	15.2%	26.6%	14.0%	17.7%
130 percent or higher	50.7%	36.3%	20.5%	31.0%	31.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Poverty Status by Reason for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps

An analysis was conducted of the poverty status of families in terms of the reasons why they were no longer on Food Stamps. For respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys, Exhibit III-28 shows the self-reported reasons given by respondents for no longer getting Food Stamps. Respondents could cite more than one reason.

As indicated, 64 percent of Cohort One and 79 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were off Food Stamps due to their employment or earnings or because of the earnings of a spouse/partner. Respondents from two-parent families were somewhat more likely than respondents from one-parent families to cite employment or earnings as a reason for being off Food Stamps.

About 24 percent of Cohort One and almost 15 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were no longer on Food Stamps because of hassles and related reasons such as pride or dignity, simply not wanting to be on Food Stamps anymore, or missing appointments with caseworkers.

EXHIBIT III-28
SELF-REPORTED REASONS FOR NO LONGER
GETTING FOOD STAMPS
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)*

	Cohort One		
Reason	One-Parent	Two-Parent	Total
N	166	172	338
Employment or earnings of self or spouse/partner	57.7%	69.4%	63.6%
Too much hassle, pride/dignity, simply didn't want to be on Food Stamps anymore, missed appointments	29.4%	18.9%	24.0%
Change in household composition and other reasons	23.1%	18.1%	20.5%
	Cohort Two		
Reason	One-Parent	Two-Parent	Total
N	132	165	282
Employment or earnings of self or spouse/partner	76.6%	84.5%	79.2%
Too much hassle, pride/dignity, simply didn't want to be on Food Stamps anymore, missed appointments	14.3%	15.4%	14.7%
Change in household composition and other reasons	11.3%	6.1%	9.6%

* Multiple responses possible

Results of the Analysis

Exhibit III-29 shows that 74 percent of Cohort One families who were no longer on Food Stamps due to hassles, requirements, or pride/dignity had earnings that placed them below the 130 percent poverty level. In addition, 54 percent of these families had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. The figures for Cohort Two were 69 percent and 55 percent, respectively.

In contrast, only 50 percent of the Cohort One families who were off Food Stamps due to employment and earnings had incomes that placed them below 130 percent of poverty, and only 32 percent had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. The figures for Cohort Two were 63 percent and 46 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-29
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY REASON FOR NO LONGER RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS**

	Cohort One*		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	200	86	71
0 percent	6.2%	20.5%	28.0%
1-49 percent	4.1%	8.1%	6.2%
50-99 percent	22.0%	25.6%	21.2%
Percent below poverty	32.3%	54.2%	55.4%
100-129 percent	18.0%	19.9%	14.1%
130 percent or higher	49.8%	26.0%	30.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	220	43	26
0 percent	17.9%	27.8%	31.5%
1-49 percent	5.6%	4.1%	8.5%
50-99 percent	22.1%	23.1%	23.1%
Percent below poverty	45.6%	55.0%	63.1%
100-129 percent	17.8%	14.3%	17.3%
130 percent or higher	36.5%	30.7%	19.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Limitations of the Analysis

The major limitation of the analysis presented above is that it does not factor in non-wage income received by respondents, such as child support and SSI. Specific data were not gathered on the amounts of child support, SSI, or other income received by respondents. Also, as noted, other household members besides the respondents and their spouses/partners are not considered in terms of income or family size.

For families still off Food Stamps, Chapter VI of this report shows that, among Cohort One, about 39 percent of the respondents in one-parent cases and 14 percent of the respondents in two-parent cases were receiving child support payments. The figures for Cohort Two were 33 percent and 16 percent, respectively. However, we do not know how much was being paid and whether the payments were received every month.

For Cohort One, Chapter VI of the report also shows that 9 percent of the one-parent households and 8 percent of the two-parent households were receiving SSI benefits. For

Cohort Two, the percentages were 14 percent and 10 percent. Again, the exact amounts of these benefits were not determined in the surveys.

Conclusions from the Analysis

Because of the above limitations, the analyses presented in this section provide only an exploratory estimate of the percentage of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers who might still meet the income criteria for Food Stamps. Another factor to consider is the assets of household members. Data from the surveys (see Chapter VI) show that at least 56 percent of the one-parent families in Cohort One owned a vehicle, and that at least 79 percent of two-parent households owned a vehicle. The figures for Cohort Two were 65 percent and 79 percent. The value of these vehicles is unknown.

Overall, the analysis suggests that certain sub-groups of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers may be particularly at risk of not receiving Food Stamp benefits even though still eligible. These groups include persons who have not completed high school and persons aged 30 and older. In addition, families who are staying off Food Stamps due to hassles and related factors appear much more likely than families staying off due to employment to be eligible for benefits.

2. POVERTY ANALYSIS BASED ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Approach to the Analysis

The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of families based on total household income reported by respondents. Household size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, their spouse/partner if present, and all other unrelated adults living in the household. Respondents were asked to report their monthly household income based on the following categories: \$0, \$1-499, \$500-999, \$1,000-1,499, \$1,500-1,999, and \$2,000 or higher. To conduct the poverty analysis, the mid-points of the ranges were used, as follows: \$0, \$250, \$750, \$1,250, and \$1,750. Respondents who reported household income of \$2,000 or higher were assigned an income of \$2,250.

In Cohort One, about 11 percent of the respondents from one-parent families and 5 percent of the respondents from two-parent families refused to provide information or said that they did not know the incomes of other household members. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 7 percent and 8 percent, respectively. These cases were taken out of the analysis, and the percentages for other respondents were adjusted proportionally.

Results by Household Type

Exhibit III-30 presents the results of the analysis. The data show that 55 percent of Cohort One and 62 percent of Cohort Two had household income that placed them below 130 percent of the poverty level. These families would appear to be eligible for Food Stamps based on reported household income, without considering assets. About 35 percent of Cohort

One and 41 percent of Cohort Two were below the poverty level. The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples in terms of the percent living below the poverty level was not statistically significant for either Cohort One or Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT III-30
POVERTY STATUS OF HOUSEHOLDS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS,
BASED ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	165	173	335
0 percent	1.4%	2.4%	1.7%
1-49 percent	8.5%	6.1%	7.7%
50-99 percent	28.3%	20.7%	25.8%
Percent below poverty	38.2%*	29.2%*	35.2%
100-129 percent	20.1%	18.9%	19.7%
130 percent or higher	41.7%	51.8%	45.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	135	154	281
0 percent	6.5%	3.9%	5.6%
1-49 percent	7.3%	6.5%	7.0%
50-99 percent	28.2%	27.9%	28.1%
Percent below poverty	42.0%*	38.3%*	40.7%
100-129 percent	20.1%	23.5%	21.2%
130 percent or higher	38.0%	38.2%	38.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was not statistically significant at the .05 level

Results by Reason for No Longer Being on Food Stamps

For Cohort One, Exhibit III-31 shows that 67 percent of the families who were off Food Stamps because of hassles and related factors had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty. In addition, almost 49 percent of these families were below 100 percent of poverty. The figures for Cohort Two were 67 percent and 48 percent, respectively.

In contrast, only 42 percent of the Cohort One families who were off Food Stamps because of employment had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty, and only 21 percent were below 100 percent of poverty. The figures for Cohort Two were 58 percent and 37 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-31
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME -- BY REASON FOR NO LONGER
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	186	86	64
0 percent	0.7%	2.1%	3.5%
1-49 percent	3.0%	11.4%	12.9%
50-99 percent	17.8%	35.2%	33.9%
Percent below poverty	21.5%	48.7%	50.3%
100-129 percent	21.0%	18.7%	13.4%
130 percent or higher	57.6%	32.6%	36.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	223	40	25
0 percent	4.7%	8.0%	8.5%
1-49 percent	7.2%	7.2%	3.0%
50-99 percent	24.8%	32.0%	49.8%
Percent below poverty	36.7%	47.2%	61.3%
100-129 percent	21.7%	20.1%	15.8%
130 percent or higher	41.7%	32.7%	22.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

CHAPTER IV: INDICATORS OF FAMILY WELL-BEING AMONG FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on various indicators of family well-being among those families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the survey. Results are presented for the following key indicators:

- adverse events,
- access to food,
- health care coverage, and
- comparisons to life on Food Stamps.

A. ADVERSE EVENTS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

This section presents findings on negative or adverse events that happened to respondents while on Food Stamps or after leaving to determine whether incidents of hardship had increased after leaving. Respondents who were still off Food Stamps were asked whether specific adverse events had happened to them. If they indicated that an event had ever happened, they were asked whether the event had occurred in the past 12 months, before the past 12 months, or in both time periods. The term “in the past 12 months” was designed to correspond roughly to the time period since they left Food Stamps. It was decided not to ask respondents whether the events had happened “since you left Food Stamps,” because we were concerned that this might bias the results.

1. Adverse Events Among the Overall Sample

Exhibit IV-1 presents the findings for the respondents who were still off Food Stamps. The exhibit shows the percentage of respondents who reported whether specific events had happened to them in the past year and before the past year.

Overview

One of the key findings from Exhibit IV-1 is that respondents in Cohort Two reported experiencing more hardships in the past year than before the last year, while respondents in Cohort One were generally less likely to report an increase in hardships. For example, the percentage who had to move because they could not afford housing increased from 6 percent to 11 percent. The percentage who fell behind on a utility bill increased from 15 percent to 49 percent. There was also a significant increase in the percentage who had gone without heat, water, or electricity, and who had had their telephone cut off. In addition, the percentage who had sent their children to live with someone else for financial reasons increased by a factor of three.

Another major finding is that only about 17 percent of the respondents in Cohort Two reported that they had experienced none of the hardships in the past year. By contrast, almost

32 percent of the respondents in Cohort One reported that they had experienced none of the hardships in the past year.

A possible explanation for these findings is that the Cohort Two respondents were dealing with the beginnings of the recession at the time when they were interviewed. In contrast, the Cohort One respondents were interviewed before the recession began.

EXHIBIT IV-1 ADVERSE EVENTS THAT HAD HAPPENED TO RESPONDENTS (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Adverse Event	Cohort One (N = 337)		Cohort Two (N = 303)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	31.0% *	38.8% *	12.6% *	40.1% *
Had to move because could not pay for housing (Moved at all in last 12 months)	21.4% *	8.4% *	6.2% *	11.5% *
Got behind on a utility bill	N/A	22.0%	N/A	24.3%
Went without electricity	32.1% *	44.6% *	14.8% *	48.8% *
Went without heat	7.0%	10.1%	2.8% *	11.0% *
Had water cut off	5.1%	5.8%	3.0% *	7.2% *
Had to go to a homeless shelter	7.1%	7.8%	2.8% *	8.1% *
Had telephone cut off	1.9%	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	29.7%	30.6%	11.9% *	32.7% *
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	3.1%	1.6%	1.3% *	4.8% *
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	13.6%	14.8%	10.3% *	21.3% *
Had a child who got in trouble with police	15.0%	7.0%	8.5%	9.0%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	3.5%	4.7%	3.5%	3.3%
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt when you could not get medical care	16.9%	17.0%	7.1% *	23.4% *
None of the above adverse events	8.9%	9.9%	3.0% *	10.5% *
	27.4%	31.8%	66.7% *	16.9% *

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Housing

As indicated in Exhibit IV-1, almost 39 percent of Cohort One reported that they had fallen behind in paying for housing in the past 12 months, compared to 31 percent who reported having had this problem before the past year. For Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 13 percent to 40 percent. About 8 percent of Cohort One reported that they had to move in the past year because they could not afford housing. This compares to 21

percent who reported having to move before the past year. Among Cohort Two, there was an increase in the percentage who had to move. Overall, 30 percent of Cohort One and 36 percent of Cohort Two had moved for any reason in the past year.

Utility Bills

Almost 45 percent of Cohort One reported that they fallen behind in paying utility bills in the past year, compared to 32 percent who had experienced this problem prior to the past year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 15 percent to 49 percent. Relatively few respondents had actually gone without electricity, heat or water in either time period, although there was an increase among Cohort Two in the percentage who had gone without utilities. Among Cohort One, there was no difference between the two time periods in the percentage of respondents whose telephones had been cut off. Among the Cohort Two, however, the percentage increased from 12 percent to almost 33 percent.

Homelessness and Children

Only a very small percentage of respondents had lived in a homeless shelter in either time period. Very few respondents in either time period reported that they had to send their children to live with someone else.

Child Care

In Cohort One, there was no difference between the two time periods in the percentage of respondents who reported problems with finding child care or paying for child care. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 10 percent to 21 percent.

Medical Care

Among Cohort One, almost 10 percent of the respondents reported that there had been times in the past year when someone in their household needed medical care but could not get it. Almost 9 percent reported having experienced this problem before the past year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 3 percent to 10.5 percent.

2. Adverse Events by Household Type

Exhibit IV-2 presents the findings on adverse events experienced by respondents, by household type.

Housing

Among Cohort One, there was little difference between respondents from one-parent families and respondents from two-parent families in the percentage who had fallen behind in housing payments in the past year or who had been forced to move in the past year due to lack of money. However, respondents from one-parent families were much more likely to have

experienced these problems before the last year. Among two-parent families, the percentage who had fallen behind in their housing payments increased from 25 percent to 39 percent. Only 8 percent of one-parent families had to move in the past year, compared to 29 percent who had experienced this problem before the past year.

Utilities

In Cohort One, there was not a major difference between respondents from one-parent families and respondents from two-parent families in the percentage who had fallen behind in a utility bill in the past year. However, among respondents from two-parent families, the percentage who had fallen behind in the past year was almost double the percentage who had experienced this problem before the past year.

Medical Care

In both cohorts, respondents from two-parent families were almost twice as likely as respondents from one-parent families to report that there had been times in the past year when a household member needed medical care but could not get it.

EXHIBIT IV-2 ADVERSE EVENTS THAT HAD HAPPENED TO RESPONDENTS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One				Cohort Two			
	1-parent (N = 166)		2-parent (N = 173)		1-parent (N = 145)		2-parent (N = 169)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	33.9%	38.7%	24.9%*	39.1%*	11.0%*	37.4%*	15.9%*	45.8%*
Had to move because could not pay for housing	28.7%*	8.0%*	9.8%	9.3%	7.8%	12.3%	3.1%*	10.0%*
(Moved at all in last 12 months)	N/A	24.0%	N/A	18.3%	N/A	24.6%	N/A	23.7%
Got behind on a utility bill	36.0%	44.3%	23.7%*	45.4%*	14.9%*	46.5%*	14.7%*	53.7%*
Went without electricity	6.2%	9.7%	8.6%	10.8%	3.6%*	12.8%*	1.2%	7.5%
Went without heat	4.3%	5.6%	6.8%	6.2%	4.1%	7.3%	0.9%	7.1%
Had water cut off	7.3%	9.6%	6.5%	3.9%	2.6%	9.3%	3.4%	5.9%
Had to go to a homeless shelter	2.4%	1.2%	0.7%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
Had telephone cut off	33.9%	30.8%	20.5%*	30.0%*	11.8%*	34.9%*	12.4%*	28.5%*
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	3.9%	1.6%	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%	6.5%	1.2%	1.5%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	13.9%	14.4%	12.9%	15.6%	11.4%*	24.5%*	8.0%	14.7%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	15.3%*	4.9%*	14.2%	11.4%	7.3%	9.8%	11.2%	7.6%
Had a child who got in trouble with police	4.6%	4.5%	1.3%	5.3%	4.0%	2.9%	2.4%	4.2%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	17.5%	14.4%	15.7%	22.5%	7.4%*	25.2%*	6.5%*	19.6%*
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt when you could not get medical care	8.0%	7.7%	10.8%	14.8%	3.2%	8.5%	2.8%*	14.7%*
None of the above adverse events	27.4%	26.4%	27.4%*	43.5%*	68.3%*	16.7%*	63.6%*	17.3%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Adverse Events by Employment Status

Exhibit IV-3 presents the findings on adverse events experienced by respondents in the past year, by current employment status.

Housing

For Cohort One, the data show that 45 percent of currently unemployed respondents had fallen behind in housing payments in the past year, compared to 36 percent of currently employed respondents. However, among Cohort Two, the pattern was reversed. Unemployed

respondents from Cohort One were about twice as likely to have had to move in the past year because of lack of money, and were also about twice as likely to have had their electricity and water cut off. Among Cohort Two, however, employment status did not have a clear impact on these indicators.

Utilities

About 38 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort One had had their telephone service cut off in the past year, compared to 28 percent of employed respondents. In Cohort Two, however, this pattern was reversed.

Medical Care

About 16 percent of the unemployed respondents in Cohort One reported that there had been occasions in the past year when someone in their home had been hurt or sick but they could not get medical care. This compares to only 7.5 percent of currently employed respondents. Among the Cohort Two, however, employment status had no impact.

Summary

Almost 31 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort One reported that none of the adverse events had happened to them in the past year, compared to 32 percent of the employed respondents. The data for Cohort Two also showed little difference between employed and unemployed respondents. Overall, the data do not show many statistically significant differences between working and non-working respondents in hardships experienced.

**EXHIBIT IV-3
ADVERSE EVENTS THAT HAD HAPPENED TO RESPONDENTS IN THE
PAST 12 MONTHS, BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		Cohort Two	
	Working	Not Working	Working	Not Working
N	243	93	220	83
Got behind in paying for rent or other housing	36.5%	44.9%	42.5%	33.7%
Had to move because could not pay for housing	6.5%	13.4%	12.6%	8.7%
(Moved at all in last 12 months)	24.9%*	13.8%*	24.8%	23.0%
Got behind on a utility bill	44.0%	46.3%	49.9%	46.3%
Went without electricity	7.7%*	16.3%*	13.3%	5.1%
Went without heat	5.5%	6.4%	7.8%	5.6%
Had water cut off	6.6%	11.1%	7.7%	9.6%
Had to go to a homeless shelter	0.7%	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%
Had telephone cut off	27.6%*	38.4%*	34.0%	29.4%
Children had to live with someone else because could not afford to take care of them	1.9%	0.8%	5.8%	2.5%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not find it	13.8%	17.4%	20.8%	22.6%
Had a car or truck taken away because could not pay for it	5.6%	10.6%	9.3%	8.5%
Had a child who got in trouble with police	3.5%	7.9%	4.2%	0.9%
Needed a regular babysitter or child care service but could not pay for it	15.2%	21.6%	24.1%	21.5%
Had someone in your home who got sick or hurt when you could not get medical care	7.5%*	16.1%*	11.0%	9.1%
None of the above adverse events	32.3%	30.6%	16.2%	18.8%

* Differences between “working” and “not working” statistically significant at the .05 level

Adverse Events by Ethnicity

The data for Cohort One show that whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to have fallen behind in housing payments in the past year, and were also more likely to have had to move because they could not pay for housing. This pattern did not hold up for Cohort Two.

In Cohort One, whites were also more likely to have fallen behind on a utility bill and to have had their electricity and water cut off. The reverse was true for Cohort Two. In Cohort One, whites were more likely than blacks to report problems in finding and paying for child care. In Cohort Two, there was no difference between blacks and whites. In both samples, whites were more likely than blacks to report that there had been occasions in the past year when someone in their home had been hurt or sick but could not get medical care.

B. ACCESS TO FOOD

Respondents who were still off Food Stamps were asked a series of questions about access to food. For Cohort Two, the questions included the six items from the short version of the USDA food security index.

Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals, by Household Type

Exhibit IV-4 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that they or any family members had cut the size of meals or skipped meals because of lack of money to buy food. As indicated in the exhibit, 25 percent of Cohort One reported that they had cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year, compared to 15 percent who had done so before the past year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 9 percent to almost 31 percent.

Among Cohort One, there was not a major difference between respondents from one-parent families and respondents from two-parent families in the percentage who had cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage was slightly higher for one-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT IV-4
DID YOU OR YOUR FAMILY EVER CUT THE SIZE OF MEALS
OR SKIP MEALS BECAUSE THERE WAS NOT ENOUGH MONEY TO
BUY FOOD? (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Percent who cut meals/skipped meals	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Cohort One (N = 337)	12.9%*	24.5%*	17.7%	25.9%	15.3%*	25.2%*
Cohort Two (N = 303)	9.1%*	32.6%*	8.7%*	26.7%*	9.0%*	30.7%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals, by Other Characteristics

Exhibit IV-5 shows the percentage of respondents who reported that they or any family members had cut the size of meals or skipped meals in the past year, by selected characteristics. The data indicate that there was no difference between employed and unemployed persons in the percentage who had cut the size of meals or skipped meals. Among the Cohort One, about 29 percent of the respondents who had not completed high school had cut the size of meals or skipped meals, compared to only 19.3 percent of those who had attended college. In Cohort Two, education had no impact. In both samples, whites were more likely than blacks to have cut the size of meals or skipped meals.

**EXHIBIT IV-5
PERCENTAGE REPORTING THAT THEY HAD CUT THE SIZE OF
MEALS OR SKIPPED MEALS IN THE PAST YEAR DUE TO LACK OF
MONEY, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristics	Cohort One	Cohort Two
<i>N</i>	337	303
<i>Employment Status</i>		
Currently working	24.9%	30.9%
Not working	25.0%	30.2%
<i>Education</i>		
Did not complete high school or GED	29.0%	29.4%
Completed high school or GED only	25.5%	29.7%
Attended college	19.3%	35.0%
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Black	21.2%	27.7%
White	30.7%	35.5%

* None of the differences between sub-groups statistically significant at the .05 level

Frequency of Cutting the Size of Meals or Skipping Meals

Respondents who reported having to cut the size of meals or skip meals were asked how often this had happened in the past year and before the past year. As shown in Exhibit IV-6, almost 37 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported having a problem in the past year stated that the problem had occurred in every month. In contrast, only 27 percent of those who reported a problem before the last year stated that it had occurred every month. For Cohort Two, however, there was a decrease in the percentage who reported that the problem had occurred every month.

Applying the 36.6 percent figure for Cohort One to the 25.2 percent who reported having a problem in the past year (see Exhibit IV-4 above), we calculate that 9.2 percent of all Cohort One had to cut the size of meals or skip meals in every month during the past year. The figure for Cohort Two was 7.7 percent.

About 45 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported having a problem in the past year stated that it happened in some months but not every month, while 17.9 percent indicated that the problem had occurred in only one or two months. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 48 percent and 27 percent.

**EXHIBIT IV-6
HOW OFTEN DID YOU OR YOUR FAMILY CUT THE SIZE OF MEALS
OR SKIP MEALS BECAUSE THERE WAS NOT ENOUGH MONEY TO
BUY FOOD? (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Response	Cohort One*					
	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year (n=21)	During Last Year (n=41)	Before Last Year (n=31)	During Last Year (n=45)	Before Last Year (n=52)	During Last Year (n=84)
Almost every month	15.2%**	36.2%**	34.5%	37.0%	26.6%	36.6%
Some months but not every month	47.5%	52.7%	45.2%	39.0%	46.1%	45.5%
Only one or two months	37.3%**	11.2%**	20.3%	24.0%	27.3%	17.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Response	Cohort Two*					
	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year (n=13)	During Last Year (n=47)	Before Last Year (n=15)	During Last Year (n=45)	Before Last Year (n=27)	During Last Year (n=93)
Almost every month	49.3%	22.7%	13.6%	30.7%	38.0%	25.0%
Some months but not every month	39.7%	52.7%	17.2%	37.9%	32.6%	48.4%
Only one or two months	11.0%	24.6%	69.2%	31.5%	29.4%	26.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* The respondents in this table are those who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals in the past year

**Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level. Sub-sample sizes for Cohort Two too small for testing

Actions Taken by Respondents

Respondents who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals were asked what actions they took to address the situation. As indicated in Exhibit IV-7, almost 83 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported that they had skipped meals in the past year dealt with the situation by getting food or money from friends or family. This was an increase from 65 percent of those who had experienced problems buying food before the last year. For Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 63 percent to 77 percent.

About 5 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had problems getting food in the past year reported that they went hungry. This was a decline from 16 percent of those who had experienced problems buying food before the past year. For Cohort Two, very few respondents reported going hungry in either time period. Combining the data from Exhibit IV-4 and Exhibit IV-4, we find that about 1.3 percent of all Cohort One respondents reported that they went hungry in the past year (25.2 percent x 5.3 percent). The figure for Cohort Two was 0.6 percent.

EXHIBIT IV-7
WHAT DID YOU DO WHEN YOU OR YOUR FAMILY DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH MONEY FOR FOOD? (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Response	Cohort One*					
	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year (n=21)	During Last Year (n=41)	Before Last Year (n=31)	During Last Year (n=45)	Before Last Year (n=52)	During Last Year (n=84)
Went hungry	17.7%	7.3%	11.6%	9.2%	16.3%	5.3%
Got meals or food at shelter/pantry	5.6%	0.0%	22.5%	16.9%	16.3%	7.4%
Got meals/food or money for food from church	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	8.5%	2.2%	4.5%
Were given food or money for food from friends or relatives	76.6%	92.7%	61.2%	65.4%	65.2%	82.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Response	Cohort Two*					
	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year (n=13)	During Last Year (n=47)	Before Last Year (n=15)	During Last Year (n=45)	Before Last Year (n=27)	During Last Year (n=93)
Went hungry	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	2.6%	1.9%
Got meals or food at shelter/pantry	15.8%	11.1%	33.3%	16.4%	21.1%	12.0%
Got meals/food or money for food from church	10.5%	9.3%	14.3%	10.9%	13.2%	9.3%
Were given food or money for food from friends or relatives	68.4%	79.6%	52.4%	65.5%	63.2%	76.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* The respondents in this table are those who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals in the past year

Reasons Why Respondents Had Problems

Respondents who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals were asked how it happened that they did not have enough money to buy food. Respondents could provide multiple answers. As shown in Exhibit IV-8, about 22 percent of Cohort One said that they spent all the money on other things besides food. The figure for Cohort Two was 45 percent.

About 21 percent of Cohort One respondents who had experienced food problems reported that they had a hard time budgeting, while 5 percent indicated that Food Stamps were not enough to pay for food. The figures for Cohort Two were 43 percent and 8 percent. About

31 percent of Cohort One and 28 percent of Cohort Two reported that they had lost a job that paid for food.

**EXHIBIT IV-8
HOW DID IT HAPPEN THAT YOU DID NOT HAVE MONEY TO BUY
FOOD IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS? – COHORT ONE
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	41	45	84*
Spent all money on things other than food	30.8%	14.6%	22.3%
Had a hard time budgeting	21.9%	21.2%	21.5%
Food Stamps were not enough to pay for food	6.2%	4.9%	5.3%
Had unexpected or emergency expenses	18.8%	20.3%	19.6%
Had more people to feed	0.0%	1.6%	0.9%
Lost financial help from friend or relative	6.2%	12.2%	9.4%
Lost job that provided food	25.9%	36.2%	31.3%
Don't know/can't say	0.0%	10.1%	5.3%
Food Stamps were cut/reduced	4.9%	0.0%	2.3%
Other	4.9%	0.0%	2.3%

* The respondents in this table are those who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals in the past year

**EXHIBIT IV-9
HOW DID IT HAPPEN THAT YOU DID NOT HAVE MONEY TO BUY
FOOD IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS? – COHORT TWO
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	47	45	93*
Spent all money on things other than food	42.3%	50.0%	44.5%
Had a hard time budgeting	48.1%	31.5%	43.4%
Lost job that provided food	29.6%	24.2%	28.1%
Food Stamps were not enough to pay for food	9.6%	4.9%	8.3%
Had unexpected or emergency expenses	5.8%	6.1%	5.9%
Lost financial help from friend or relative	1.5%	9.3%	3.8%
Had more people to feed	1.5%	2.8%	1.9%
Quit Food Stamps and realized later still needed them	0.0%	2.8%	0.8%
Other	5.4%	1.6%	4.3%

* The respondents in this table are those who reported that they had to cut the size of meals or skip meals in the past year

Eating Less Due to Lack of Money

Respondents were asked whether they had ever eaten less than they felt they should because there was not enough money to buy food. As shown in Exhibit IV-10, 27 percent of Cohort One reported that, in the last 12 months, they had eaten less on occasion than they felt they should. This compares to almost 22 percent of respondents who reported having a similar problem before the last year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased from 11 percent to 26 percent. Respondents from one-parent families were somewhat more likely to report having had a problem in the past year than respondents from two-parent families.

**EXHIBIT IV-10
DID YOU EVER EAT LESS THAN YOU FELT YOU SHOULD BECAUSE
THERE WAS NOT ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY FOOD?
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Response	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Cohort One (N = 337)	21.1%	28.9%	22.4%	25.5%	21.8%	27.1%
Cohort Two (N = 303)	12.4%*	28.2%*	7.6%*	22.9%*	10.8%*	26.4%*

* Differences between “before” and “during” statistically significant at the .05 level

Not Eating When Hungry

Respondents were asked whether they were ever hungry but did not eat because they could not afford food. Exhibit IV-11 indicates that 10.7 percent of Cohort One reported having this problem in the past year – exactly the same as the percentage in the period before the past year. Among Cohort Two, the percentage increased slightly from 5.0 percent to 7.6 percent. Respondents from one-parent families were slightly more likely than respondents from two-parent families to report having a problem in the past year.

EXHIBIT IV-11
WERE YOU EVER HUNGRY BUT DIDN'T EAT BECAUSE YOU
COULDN'T AFFORD FOOD? (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Response	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Cohort One (N = 337)	10.1%	11.6%	11.4%	9.8%	10.7%	10.7%
Cohort Two (N = 303)	6.3%	8.3%	2.4%	6.1%	5.0%	7.6%

* None of the differences between “before” and “during” were statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Not Lasting

The Cohort Two respondents were asked the question: “The food that I bought just didn’t last, and I didn’t have money to get more. Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you?” As shown in Exhibit IV-12, about 16 percent of the respondents reported that this was often true for them in the past year, compared to 12 percent before the past year. Another 41 percent reported that it was sometimes true in the past year, compared to 43 percent before the past year.

EXHIBIT IV-12
“THE FOOD THAT I BOUGHT JUST DID NOT LAST AND I DID NOT
HAVE MONEY TO GET MORE” -- HOW OFTEN TRUE?
-- COHORT TWO (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Response	1-parent (N = 145)		2-parent (N = 169)		Total (N = 303)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Often true	11.9%	15.4%	13.7%	16.4%	12.5%	15.8%
Sometimes true	42.4%	41.9%	43.1%	38.1%	42.6%	40.7%
Never true	45.7%	42.7%	43.3%	45.4%	44.9%	43.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* None of the differences between “before” and “during” were statistically significant at the .05 level

Eating Balanced Meals

The Cohort Two respondents were asked the question “We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals. Was this often true, sometimes true, or never true for you?” As indicated in Exhibit IV-13, 12.5 percent of all respondents reported that it was often true in the past year –

about the same as before the past year. Another 28 percent reported that it was sometimes true in the past year, compared to 27 percent before the past year.

EXHIBIT IV-13
“I/WE COULD NOT AFFORD TO EAT BALANCED MEALS”
-- HOW OFTEN TRUE? – COHORT TWO
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Response	1-parent (N = 145)		2-parent (N = 169)		Total (N = 303)	
	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year	Before Last Year	During Last Year
Often true	12.7%	11.4%	13.5%	14.7%	12.9%	12.5%
Sometimes true	24.7%	27.9%	32.6%	29.4%	27.3%	28.4%
Never true	62.6%	60.7%	53.8%	55.9%	59.7%	59.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* None of the differences between “before” and “during” were statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security Index

The six-item USDA Food Security Index was calculated for Cohort Two. The index could not be calculated for Cohort One because of the format of the questions used in the initial survey. Exhibit IV-14 indicates that about 53 percent of Cohort Two could be classified as food secure in the year since leaving Food Stamps. Almost 32 percent were food insecure without hunger, including 36 percent of the two-parent cases. About 15 percent were food insecure with hunger, including 18 percent of the one-parent cases. The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level.

EXHIBIT IV-14
FOOD SECURITY INDEX, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE,
COHORT TWO (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Food Security	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Food secure	52.3%	54.0%	52.9%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	29.5%	36.0%	31.6%
Food insecure with hunger evident	18.2%*	10.0%*	15.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security Index by Gender

Exhibit IV-15 shows that 63 percent of males were food secure, compared to only 52 percent of females. However, almost 19 percent of males were food insecure with hunger, compared to only 15 percent of females.

EXHIBIT IV-15 FOOD SECURITY INDEX, BY GENDER, COHORT TWO (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Food Security	Female	Male
N	128	114
Food secure	52.2%	63.2%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	32.5%*	17.9%*
Food insecure with hunger evident	15.3%	18.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

* The difference between females and males was statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security Index by Ethnicity

Exhibit IV-16 shows that 19 percent of whites were food insecure with hunger, compared to only 13 percent of blacks.

EXHIBIT IV-16 FOOD SECURITY INDEX, BY ETHNICITY, COHORT TWO (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Food Security	Black	White
N	189	151
Food secure	54.4%	50.5%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	32.5%	30.5%
Food insecure with hunger evident	13.1%	19.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

* The difference between blacks and whites was **not** statistically significant at the .05 level

Food Security Index by Age, Education, and Employment Status

The data showed that there was no consistent relationship between food security and age among the respondents. In addition, food security did not vary consistently by education among the sample.

As indicated in Exhibit IV-17, food security did not vary much by the employment status of the respondents themselves. However, food insecurity was especially high among respondents who were not working and not living with an employed adult – about 27 percent of these respondents were food insecure with hunger.

EXHIBIT IV-17
FOOD SECURITY INDEX, BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF
RESPONDENT AND OTHER ADULTS, COHORT TWO
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Food Security	Respondent Employed	Respondent Not Employed, But Living with Employed Adult	Respondent Not Employed, and Not Living with Employed Adult
N	122	52	68
Food secure	52.9%	57.8%	49.2%
Food insecure with no hunger evident	34.2%	26.3%	23.6%
Food insecure with hunger evident	12.9%*	15.9%	27.2%*
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Difference was statistically significant at the .05 level

C. ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

Health Insurance Coverage

Respondents were asked whether they, or the people who lived with them, had some type of health insurance coverage, including Medicaid. As indicated in Exhibit IV-18, about 79 percent of the Cohort One and 87 percent of the Cohort Two answered “yes” to this question.

EXHIBIT IV-18
DO YOU OR OTHER PEOPLE WHO LIVE WITH YOU HAVE SOME
KIND OF HEALTH INSURANCE, INCLUDING MEDICAID?
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	164	173	337
Yes	74.9%*	82.2%*	78.7%
No	25.1%	17.8%	21.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	168	303
Yes	86.4%*	86.9%*	86.6%
No	13.6%	13.1%	13.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were not statistically significant at the .05 level

Type of Health Coverage

Respondents who reported that they or a household member had some type of health coverage were asked what type of coverage they had. As indicated in Exhibit IV-19, about 77 percent of Cohort One and 82 percent of Cohort Two reported that the coverage was through Medicaid. About 39 percent of Cohort One and 40 percent of Cohort Two reported that their health coverage was through private insurance (respondents could report different types of health coverage for different household members).

**EXHIBIT IV-19
WHAT TYPE OF MEDICAL COVERAGE DO YOU HAVE?
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	123	142	265
Medicaid	72.1%	81.6%	77.2%
Private insurance	41.2%	37.3%	39.1%
Medicare	3.8%	2.3%	3.0%
CHAMPUS	0.0%	1.4%	0.8%
	Cohort Two		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	125	146	262
Medicaid	83.5%	79.5%	82.2%
Private insurance	39.3%	42.3%	40.3%
Medicare	0.6%	1.9%	1.0%
CHAMPUS	1.2%	0.5%	1.0%

Private Health Coverage

Respondents who reported that they or a household member were covered by private health insurance were asked who paid for the coverage. As indicated in Exhibit IV-20, about 74 percent of these respondents from Cohort One reported that their employer paid all or part of the health coverage. The figure for Cohort Two was 78 percent.

**EXHIBIT IV-20
IF COVERED BY PRIVATE INSURANCE, WHO PAYS FOR IT?
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	51	53	104
Employer pays all or part of premium	69.5%	78.7%	74.2%
I pay for all or part of it myself	22.2%	17.5%	19.8%
Absent parent pays all or part	6.8%	3.8%	5.3%
Other	9.0%	2.8%	5.8%
	Cohort Two		
Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	49	62	106
Employer pays all or part of premium	75.3%	82.9%	77.9%
I pay for all or part of it myself	24.7%	22.3%	23.9%
Absent parent pays all or part	16.2%	2.1%	11.4%
Other	0.0%	3.2%	1.1%

Profile of Respondents Who Reported Problems with Health Care Access

As shown previously in Exhibit IV-1, about 10 percent of Cohort One and Cohort Two reported that there had been times in the past year when someone in their home had been sick or hurt but could not get medical care. Exhibit IV-21 shows the percentage of respondents who reported this problem, by selected characteristics. As shown in the exhibit, Cohort One respondents who were not currently working were about twice as likely to report having had this problem as persons currently working. However, there was little difference between employed and unemployed persons in Cohort Two.

Almost 20 percent of Cohort One who were not covered by Medicaid reported having had a problem, compared to 8 percent of those currently on Medicaid. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 15 percent and 9 percent, respectively. Whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to report having a problem.

EXHIBIT IV-21 RESPONDENTS REPORTING OCCASIONS WHEN SOMEONE IN THEIR HOME WAS SICK OR HURT IN THE PAST YEAR AND COULD NOT GET MEDICAL CARE, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One	Cohort Two
<i>N</i>	33	32
<i>Employment Status</i>		
Currently working	7.5%	11.0%
Not working	16.1%	9.1%
<i>Medicaid Status</i>		
Receiving Medicaid benefits	8.3%	8.6%
Not receiving Medicaid	19.5%	15.0%
<i>Education</i>		
Did not complete high school or GED	18.4%	11.6%
Completed high school or GED only	8.0%	7.4%
Attended college	5.7%	17.6%
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Black	6.0%	9.6%
White	16.6%	12.2%
<i>Age</i>		
18-24	8.3%	8.4%
25-29	4.0%	5.2%
30-34	12.1%	9.7%
35-39	6.6%	8.9%
40+	15.7%	21.6%

* Sub-sample sizes too small for statistical testing

Health Coverage for Children

Cohort Two respondents were asked if they had any children who were not covered by health insurance. As indicated in Exhibit IV-22, almost 5 percent of the Cohort Two reported that they had at least one child who was not covered by health insurance. Of those respondents who were not in a Medicaid household, almost 11 percent had at least one child without health coverage. Almost 9 percent of high school drop-outs had at least one child without health coverage. Of the respondents aged 40 and older, 14 percent had at least one child without health coverage.

**EXHIBIT IV-22
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD ONE OR MORE CHILDREN
NOT COVERED BY HEALTH INSURANCE, BY SELECTED
CHARACTERISTICS – COHORT TWO
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Percent
<i>N</i>	271
<i>Case Type</i>	
One-parent	4.4%
Two-parent	5.7%
<i>Employment Status</i>	
Currently working	4.2%
Not working	6.5%
<i>Medicaid Status</i>	
Receiving Medicaid benefits	3.5% *
Not receiving Medicaid	10.7% *
<i>Education</i>	
Did not complete high school or GED	8.9%
Completed high school or GED only	4.5%
Attended college	0.0%
<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Black	3.3%
White	7.1%
<i>Age</i>	
18-24	1.4%
25-29	2.4%
30-34	7.1%
35-39	0.0%
40+	14.0%
TOTAL	4.8%

* Difference was statistically significant at the .05 level

D. LIFE SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with three statements relating to the quality of their lives since leaving Food Stamps.

Results for the Overall Sample

As shown in Exhibit IV-23, almost 87 percent of Cohort One and 85 percent of Cohort Two agreed that they felt better about themselves than a year ago. However, almost 58 percent of Cohort One and 51 percent of Cohort Two agreed with the statement that they worried more about their family than a year ago. About 46 percent of Cohort One and 48 percent of Cohort Two reported that they felt more stress than a year ago.

**EXHIBIT IV-23
VIEW OF LIFE SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One			
Statement	Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
	N	166	173	339
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	86.0%*	87.5%*	86.7%
	Disagree	14.0%	12.5%	13.3%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	54.8%*	60.6%*	57.8%
	Disagree	45.2%	39.4%	42.2%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	46.5%*	46.3%*	46.4%
	Disagree	53.5%	53.7%	53.6%
	Cohort Two			
Statement	Response	1-parent	2-parent	Total
	N	145	169	303
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	83.9%	87.6%	85.1%
	Disagree	16.1%	12.4%	14.9%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	52.6%	49.2%	51.5%
	Disagree	47.4%	50.8%	48.5%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	48.9%	45.8%	47.9%
	Disagree	51.1%	54.2%	52.1%

*None of the differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were statistically significant at the .05 level

Life Since Leaving Food Stamps, by Employment Status

Exhibit IV-24 compares working and non-working respondents in terms of whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements about their life since leaving Food Stamps. In Cohort One, 90 percent of employed respondents said that they felt better about themselves

than a year ago, compared to 76 percent of non-working respondents. For Cohort Two, the figures were 87 percent and 81 percent.

Among Cohort One, almost 70 percent of non-working respondents were more worried about their families than a year ago, compared to only 52 percent of working respondents. For Cohort Two, the figures were 62 percent and 47 percent. Almost 54 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort One felt more stress than a year ago, compared to 44 percent of working respondents. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 58 percent and 44 percent.

EXHIBIT IV-24 VIEW OF LIFE SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS, BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Statement	Cohort One		
	Response	Working	Not Working
	N	243	93
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	90.3% *	76.5% *
	Disagree	9.7%	23.5%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	51.6% *	69.6% *
	Disagree	48.4%	30.4%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	43.6%	53.8%
	Disagree	56.4%	46.2%
Statement	Cohort Two		
	Response	Working	Not Working
	N	220	83
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	86.6%	81.3%
	Disagree	13.4%	18.7%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	47.5% *	61.9% *
	Disagree	52.5%	38.1%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	44.1% *	58.0% *
	Disagree	55.9%	42.0%

* Differences were statistically significant at the .05 level

Life Since Leaving Food Stamps, by Ethnicity

The data showed that there was not a major difference between blacks and whites.

Life Since Leaving Food Stamps, by Education

Exhibit IV-25 compares different educational groups in terms of whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements about their life since leaving Food Stamps. As indicated, about two-thirds of the Cohort One respondents who had not completed high school reported that they worried more about their family than a year ago, compared to only 43 percent of those

who had attended college. In Cohort Two, persons who had attended college were also less likely to report being more worried about their family.

EXHIBIT IV-25 VIEW OF LIFE SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS, BY EDUCATION (PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

		Cohort One		
Statement	Response	Did Not Complete High School	Completed High School Only	Attended College
	N	79	181	76
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	81.7%	90.1%	82.7%
	Disagree	18.3%	9.9%	17.3%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	66.5%*	58.1%*	42.7%*
	Disagree	33.5%	41.9%	57.3%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	55.1%**	42.1%**	47.8%
	Disagree	44.9%	57.9%	52.2%
		Cohort Two		
Statement	Response	Did Not Complete High School	Completed High School Only	Attended College
	N	76	168	60
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	89.3%	83.7%	83.9%
	Disagree	10.7%	16.3%	16.1%
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	51.2%	55.0%	41.8%
	Disagree	48.8%	45.0%	58.2%
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	49.8%	48.5%	43.8%
	Disagree	50.2%	51.5%	56.2%

* The difference between high school drop-outs and other respondents was statistically significant at the .05 level

** Statistically significant at the .05 level

CHAPTER V: CHILD OUTCOMES AND WELL-BEING AMONG FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on child outcomes and well-being among the families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. The following topics are covered:

- background and objectives of the analysis;
- selection of the focal child;
- child outcomes and well-being; and
- respondents' perceptions about the quality of their neighborhood as a place to raise children.

The Appendix to the report presents additional analyses of the child outcome data, using a "child outcomes index."

A. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ANALYSIS

The primary objective of analyzing child outcomes among the families in the two cohorts was to determine whether there was any evidence of negative child outcomes among the families. A major concern of policy makers was whether the experience of leaving the Food Stamp program may have negative impacts upon the children. Such negative impacts may occur, for example, if families do not have enough resources to obtain food or other necessities as a result of leaving the program. These negative outcomes may be particularly likely among families in which the parent(s) do not obtain stable employment at suitable wages after leaving the Food Stamp program.

Ideally, this issue would be addressed through an experimental research design involving comparable treatment and control groups. For example, we might compare families who leave Food Stamps and families who stay on Food Stamps to determine whether child outcomes differ among the two groups. This is not a perfect research design, but it might help to control for some of the effects of normal childhood development.

This type of design, however, was not incorporated into the current study. Instead, the questions on child outcomes were added to the survey using the simple pre-post research design involving the two cohorts of Food Stamp leavers. To assist with the design of the child outcome questions in the context of a quasi-experimental research design, MAXIMUS obtained input from Child Trends, Inc., a recognized authority on studies of child outcomes. Child Trends recommended an approach in which the survey respondents were asked to identify changes in their child's behavior, mood, school performance, and other outcomes "compared to one year ago." This time frame was designed to correspond to the period since leaving Food Stamps. Respondents were asked to identify positive or negative changes.

The approach that was used in the study should be treated with caution because of the limitations of the research design. One concern is that some of the changes reported by

respondents may have been partly the result of normal childhood development. To some extent, this concern is addressed by the fact that we asked the respondents to focus only on the last 12 months. Another point to emphasize is that respondents were asked the questions only for children aged 5-17.

The focus of the analysis, however, is mostly on uncovering any evidence of negative child outcomes that might be associated with the process of leaving Food Stamps. There is no implication of any causal relationship between leaving Food Stamps and either positive or negative child outcomes among the cohorts.

B. SELECTION OF THE FOCAL CHILD

Each respondent was asked a series of questions about the well-being of a “focal child.” The focal child was selected as follows:

- If the respondent had only one school-age child, this child was selected as the focal child.
- If the respondent had more than one school-age child, the focal child was the one with the earliest birthday in the calendar year, regardless of the birth year.
- If the respondent had no school-age children, the respondent’s oldest pre-school child was selected as the focal child, but the respondent in these cases was asked only about the child’s health, not about other indicators of well-being.

C. FINDINGS ON CHILD OUTCOMES

Respondents were asked a series of questions about changes in the child’s well-being in the past year. The sections below present the results from the surveys. For each question, we examine the results by the following variables:

- employment status;
- ethnicity;
- education; and
- age of the child.

NOTE: Statistical tests of significance were conducted on the differences among sub-groups of respondents, focusing only on the question of whether they differed in terms of negative outcomes. For some of the sub-groups, the sub-sample sizes were too small for analysis.

1. GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER CHILDREN

Exhibit V-1 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that the (focal child) gets along better with other children, gets along worse, or is about the same.” The data indicate that 40.7 percent of Cohort One felt that their child was getting along better with other children, 4.0 percent thought that the child was getting along worse with other children, and 55.3 percent thought that there was no change.

In Cohort Two, 46.7 percent felt that their child was getting along better with other children, 5.6 percent thought that the child was getting along worse with other children, and 47.8 percent thought that there was no change.

The data for Cohort One show that unemployed respondents (7.8 percent) were about three times as likely as employed respondents (2.4 percent) to report that their child got along worse with other children. However, this relationship was reversed in Cohort Two. Whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to think that their child was getting along worse with other children. None of the other variables in the exhibit showed a clear relationship with respondent perceptions.

EXHIBIT V-1 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT (FOCAL CHILD) GETS ALONG BETTER WITH OTHER CHILDREN, GETS ALONG WORSE, OR IS ABOUT THE SAME? (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total
Overall	278	40.7%	4.0%	55.3%	100.0%	243	46.7%	5.6%	47.8%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	41.6%	3.4%	55.0%	100.0%	119	46.5%	7.2%	46.3%	100.0%
2-parent	137	39.7%	4.8%	55.6%	100.0%	130	47.1%	2.0%	51.0%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	43.1%	2.4%*	54.5%	100.0%	180	44.2%	6.5%	49.3%	100.0%
Not Working	71	34.9%	7.8%*	57.3%	100.0%	63	53.6%	2.9%	43.5%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	43.4%	2.2%	54.4%	100.0%	154	52.4%	3.7%	43.9%	100.0%
White	96	37.5%	6.8%	55.7%	100.0%	89	36.8%	8.8%	54.4%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	34.5%	8.6%	56.9%	100.0%	61	46.5%	6.3%	47.2%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	47.2%	2.0%	50.8%	100.0%	133	46.7%	5.9%	47.4%	100.0%
Attended college	66	33.3%	3.1%	63.6%	100.0%	49	46.8%	3.7%	49.5%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	45.7%	7.3%	47.1%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	49.0%	1.5%	49.5%	100.0%

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level

2. CHILD’S BEHAVIOR

Exhibit V-2 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that (focal child) behaves better, worse, or is about the same?” As indicated, 38.9 percent of Cohort One thought that their child behaved better, 9.1 percent thought that their child behaved worse, and 52.0 percent saw no change. About 40 percent of Cohort Two thought that their child behaved better, 8 percent thought that their child behaved worse, and 52 percent saw no change.

In Cohort One, high school drop-outs were much more likely than other respondents to think that their child was behaving worse. However, this pattern was not evident in Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT V-2
COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT (FOCAL CHILD) BEHAVES BETTER, WORSE, OR IS ABOUT THE SAME?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total
Overall	278	38.9%	9.1%	52.0%	100.0%	243	40.0%	8.0%	52.0%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	42.1%	9.7%	48.2%	100.0%	119	42.2%	9.0%	48.8%	100.0%
2-parent	137	35.6%	8.6%	55.8%	100.0%	130	35.3%	5.6%	59.1%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	42.7%	8.6%	48.7%	100.0%	180	39.8%	9.3%	50.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	32.7%	11.5%	55.8%	100.0%	63	40.6%	4.0%	55.4%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	41.5%	8.6%	49.9%	100.0%	154	40.0%	7.6%	52.4%	100.0%
White	96	37.4%	10.9%	51.7%	100.0%	89	40.0%	8.6%	51.4%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	28.4%	17.7%*	53.9%	100.0%	61	42.1%	6.5%	51.4%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	48.5%	6.4%*	45.1%	100.0%	133	37.3%	7.5%	55.2%	100.0%
Attended college	66	32.6%	8.0%*	59.4%	100.0%	49	45.0%	11.0%	44.0%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	40.6%	9.8%	49.6%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	38.6%	3.5%	49.5%	100.0%

* Difference between high school drop-outs and all other respondents statistically significant at the .05 level

3. CHILD’S PERSONALITY

Exhibit V-3 presents data on responses to the questions: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that (focal child) is more outgoing, less outgoing, or is about the same?” The data show that 55.7 percent of Cohort One thought that their child was more outgoing, 3.7 percent thought that the child was less outgoing, and 40.6 percent saw no change. About 55 percent of Cohort Two thought that their child was more outgoing, 5.7 percent thought that the child was less outgoing, and 39.2 percent saw no change.

In both cohorts, working respondents were somewhat more likely than non-working respondents to think that their child was more outgoing. Whites were slightly more likely than blacks to think that their child was less outgoing.

**EXHIBIT V-3
COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
(FOCAL CHILD) IS MORE OUTGOING, LESS OUTGOING, OR ABOUT
THE SAME? (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	55.7%	3.7%	40.6%	100.0%	243	55.1%	5.7%	39.2%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	55.4%	4.4%	40.2%	100.0%	119	53.2%	7.8%	39.0%	100.0%
2-parent	137	56.0%	3.1%	41.0%	100.0%	130	59.2%	1.1%	39.6%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	57.5%	2.7%*	39.8%	100.0%	180	56.8%	5.5%	37.7%	100.0%
Not Working	71	49.8%	7.9%*	42.3%	100.0%	63	50.1%	6.4%	43.5%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	55.4%	3.2%	41.4%	100.0%	154	59.8%	3.7%	36.4%	100.0%
White	96	55.9%	5.6%	38.6%	100.0%	89	46.9%	9.2%	43.9%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	51.8%	8.5%	39.6%	100.0%	61	48.9%	4.6%	46.5%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	56.5%	1.8%	41.8%	100.0%	133	56.2%	7.0%	36.8%	100.0%
Attended college	66	57.3%	4.6%	38.1%	100.0%	49	59.7%	3.7%	36.6%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	59.9%	5.4%	34.6%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	43.3%	6.4%	50.3%	100.0%

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level

4. PARENT’S REACTION TO CHILD’S BEHAVIOR

Exhibit V-4 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your (focal child’s) behavior bothers you more often, less often, or about the same?” As indicated, 13.4 percent of Cohort One said that their child’s behavior bothered them more often, 22.0 percent said it bothered them less often, and 64.6 percent said that there was no change. Of Cohort Two, 13.5 percent said that their child’s behavior bothered them more often, 20.6 percent said it bothered them less often, and 65.9 percent said that there was no change.

In Cohort One, unemployed respondents were more likely than working respondents to see problems, but this pattern was reversed in Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT V-4
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
 YOUR CHILD’S BEHAVIOR BOTHERS YOU MORE OFTEN,
 LESS OFTEN, OR ABOUT THE SAME?
 (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	13.4%	22.0%	64.6%	100.0%	243	13.5%	20.6%	65.9%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	18.4%	21.5%	60.0%	100.0%	119	14.3%	23.0%	62.7%	100.0%
2-parent	137	8.2%	22.6%	69.2%	100.0%	130	11.8%	15.4%	72.8%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	13.3%*	25.3%	61.4%	100.0%	180	15.9%	22.3%	61.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	21.3%*	11.7%	67.0%	100.0%	63	6.5%	15.9%	77.5%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	14.2%	19.4%	66.4%	100.0%	154	12.9%	22.3%	64.9%	100.0%
White	96	17.9%	26.9%	55.2%	100.0%	89	14.6%	17.8%	67.6%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	25.4%**	11.3%	63.3%	100.0%	61	14.5%	27.6%	57.9%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	14.5%**	24.4%	61.2%	100.0%	133	9.0%	19.1%	71.9%	100.0%
Attended college	66	7.7%**	26.3%	66.0%	100.0%	49	24.7%	16.1%	59.3%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	14.8%	21.1%	64.0%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	10.2%	19.5%	70.3%	100.0%

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level ** Difference between high school drop-outs and all other respondents statistically significant at the .05 level.

5. CHANGES IN CHILD’S MOOD

Exhibit V-5 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your (focal child) is more happy, less happy, or about the same?” As shown, 49.0 percent of Cohort One said that their child was happier, 7.3 percent said that their child was less happy, and 43.7 percent saw no change. Of Cohort Two, 47.1 percent said that their child was more happy, 5.4 percent said that their child was less happy, and 47.4 percent saw no change.

In Cohort One, working respondents were much more likely than non-working respondents to think that their child was happier. However, this did not hold true for Cohort Two. In Cohort One, high school drop-outs were much more likely to think that their child was less happy. This was not the case with Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT V-5
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
 (FOCAL CHILD) IS MORE HAPPY, LESS HAPPY,
 OR ABOUT THE SAME? (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	49.0%	7.3%	43.7%	100.0%	243	47.1%	5.4%	47.4%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	48.5%	10.2%	41.4%	100.0%	119	49.2%	6.3%	44.5%	100.0%
2-parent	137	49.6%	4.4%	46.0%	100.0%	130	42.6%	3.5%	53.9%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	53.2%	7.0%	39.8%	100.0%	180	46.4%	6.7%	46.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	35.8%	12.6%	51.5%	100.0%	63	49.1%	1.6%	49.2%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	50.1%	7.7%	42.3%	100.0%	154	46.9%	2.3%	50.8%	100.0%
White	96	45.7%	9.6%	44.7%	100.0%	89	47.6%	10.8%	41.6%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	37.7%	14.1%	48.3%	100.0%	61	43.5%	5.8%	50.7%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	55.6%	6.5%	37.9%	100.0%	133	48.7%	3.2%	48.1%	100.0%
Attended college	66	44.1%	7.3%	48.6%	100.0%	49	47.5%	10.9%	41.6%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	48.2%	6.4%	45.3%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	44.5%	2.9%	52.6%	100.0%

6. CHANGES IN CHILD’S TEMPERAMENT

Exhibit V-6 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your (focal child) is more calm and easy-going, less calm and easy-going, or about the same?” As shown, 34.4 percent of Cohort One thought that their child was more calm and easy-going, 9.0 percent thought their child was less calm and easy-going, and 56.6 percent saw no change. Of Cohort Two, 37.5 percent thought that their child was more calm and easy-going, 12.2 percent thought their child was less calm and easy-going, and 50.3 percent saw no change.

In both cohorts, working respondents were more likely than non-working respondents to think that their child was more calm and easygoing. In both cohorts, more educated respondents were somewhat more likely to think that their child was calmer and more easygoing.

EXHIBIT V-6
COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
(FOCAL CHILD) IS MORE CALM AND EASY-GOING, LESS CALM AND
EASY-GOING OR ABOUT THE SAME?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	34.4%	9.0%	56.6%	100.0%	243	37.5%	12.2%	50.3%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	33.4%	12.1%	54.5%	100.0%	119	40.5%	13.5%	46.0%	100.0%
2-parent	137	35.4%	5.8%	58.8%	100.0%	130	30.9%	9.2%	59.8%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	37.1%	9.3%	53.6%	100.0%	180	39.4%	13.9%	46.6%	100.0%
Not Working	71	25.0%	12.9%	62.1%	100.0%	63	31.9%	7.1%	61.0%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	36.1%	10.3%	53.6%	100.0%	154	42.4%	13.5%	44.0%	100.0%
White	96	30.9%	10.3%	58.8%	100.0%	89	29.0%	9.8%	61.2%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	30.6%	15.3%	54.2%	100.0%	61	39.0%	12.0%	49.0%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	34.3%	9.6%	56.2%	100.0%	133	38.2%	13.1%	48.7%	100.0%
Attended college	66	36.8%	6.8%	56.4%	100.0%	49	33.8%	9.7%	56.5%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	35.7%	12.9%	51.4%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	41.8%	10.3%	47.9%	100.0%

7. CHILD’S CONCERN FOR THE FEELINGS OF OTHERS

Exhibit V-7 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that (focal child) shows more concern for the feelings of others, less concern, or is about the same?” As indicated, 54.7 percent of Cohort One thought that their child showed more concern for the feelings of others, 4.4 percent thought that their child showed less concern, and 40.9 percent saw no change in their child. Of Cohort Two, 58.3 percent thought that their child showed more concern for the feelings of others, 4.7 percent thought that their child showed less concern, and 37.0 percent saw no change in their child.

In both cohorts, one-parent cases were somewhat more likely to think that their child cared less for the feelings of others.

**EXHIBIT V-7
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
 (FOCAL CHILD) SHOWS MORE CONCERN FOR THE FEELINGS OF
 OTHERS, LESS CONCERN OR ABOUT THE SAME?
 (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	54.7%	4.4%	40.9%	100.0%	243	58.3%	4.7%	37.0%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	52.7%	6.3%	41.0%	100.0%	119	59.7%	6.5%	33.9%	100.0%
2-parent	137	56.7%	2.5%	40.7%	100.0%	130	55.3%	1.0%	43.7%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	57.2%	3.8%	38.9%	100.0%	180	58.0%	4.8%	37.2%	100.0%
Not Working	71	44.2%	9.1%	46.7%	100.0%	63	59.2%	4.5%	36.3%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	55.4%	4.7%	39.9%	100.0%	154	63.9%	5.2%	30.9%	100.0%
White	96	51.6%	6.1%	42.2%	100.0%	89	48.7%	4.0%	47.4%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	46.9%	10.2%	43.0%	100.0%	61	43.1%	7.5%	49.4%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	58.3%	2.3%	39.3%	100.0%	133	63.6%	2.9%	33.6%	100.0%
Attended college	66	50.7%	6.8%	42.5%	100.0%	49	63.1%	6.4%	30.5%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	60.0%	6.1%	33.9%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	54.3%	1.5%	44.3%	100.0%

8. CHILD'S SCHOOL SITUATION

Exhibit V-8 presents data on responses to the question: “Would you say that your (focal child) has been doing very well, well, average, below average, or not well at all in school?” As indicated, 43 percent of Cohort One thought that their child was doing well or very well in school, while 11 percent thought that their child was doing below average or not well at all. Of Cohort Two, 42 percent thought that their child was doing well or very well in school, while 13 percent thought that their child was doing below average or not well at all.

In Cohort One, working respondents were much more likely to think that their child was doing well in school. In Cohort Two, employment status of the respondents had less impact. In Cohort One, more educated respondents were much more likely to think that their child was doing well in school. In Cohort Two, education was less clearly related to respondent perceptions about the school situation of the child.

EXHIBIT V-8
WOULD YOU SAY THAT (FOCAL CHILD) HAS BEEN DOING VERY WELL, WELL, AVERAGE, BELOW AVERAGE OR NOT WELL AT ALL IN SCHOOL? (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One						Cohort Two					
	N	Very Well	Well	Average	Below Average	Not Well At All	N	Very Well	Well	Average	Below Average	Not Well At All
Overall	278	43.0%	21.7%	24.4%	8.2%	2.8%	243	42.2%	25.4%	19.6%	8.4%	4.4%
Household type												
1-parent	141	42.9%	23.3%	23.2%	7.7%	2.8%	119	37.0%	28.4%	18.9%	10.1%	5.7%
2-parent	137	43.1%	20.0%	25.6%	8.6%	2.7%	130	53.6%	19.0%	21.0%	4.8%	1.5%
Employment Status												
Working	208	49.7%	19.6%	22.7%	6.4%	1.5%	180	43.1%	24.8%	18.6%	9.7%	3.8%
Not Working	71	23.3%	30.2%	27.5%	12.6%	6.4%	63	39.5%	27.3%	22.2%	4.9%	6.1%
Ethnicity												
Black	181	41.3%	24.4%	24.4%	7.4%	2.6%	154	43.3%	27.0%	18.8%	6.5%	4.4%
White	96	46.7%	17.0%	23.6%	9.4%	3.2%	89	40.2%	22.7%	20.9%	11.9%	4.3%
Education												
Did not complete high school	64	28.6%	26.6%	24.1%	14.3%	6.4%	61	40.2%	31.7%	11.7%	8.9%	7.5%
Completed high school only	150	43.2%	23.7%	24.8%	6.8%	1.5%	133	40.4%	24.5%	24.2%	7.8%	3.2%
Attended college	66	56.4%	15.1%	21.7%	4.6%	2.2%	49	49.6%	20.1%	16.9%	9.7%	3.7%
Age of Child												
5-12 years old							172	45.5%	22.1%	18.3%	10.2%	3.9%
13-17 years old							71	34.1%	33.5%	22.7%	4.1%	5.6%

9. CHILD’S SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

Exhibit V-9 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your (focal child) has been doing better at schoolwork, worse at schoolwork, or about the same?” As indicated, 53.5 percent of Cohort One thought that their child was doing better at schoolwork, 8.7 percent thought their child was doing worse, and 37.8 percent thought the child was doing about the same. Of Cohort Two, 61.9 percent thought that their child was doing better at schoolwork, 12.0 percent thought their child was doing worse, and 26.1 percent thought the child was doing about the same.

In Cohort One, persons who were employed were much more likely to think that their child was doing better. In Cohort Two, the relationship was less clear. In both cohorts, blacks were more likely than whites to think that their child was doing better. In addition, the more educated respondents were more likely to think that their child was doing better.

**EXHIBIT V-9
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
 (FOCAL CHILD) HAS BEEN DOING BETTER AT SCHOOLWORK,
 WORSE AT SCHOOLWORK OR ABOUT THE SAME?
 (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total
Overall	278	53.5%	8.7%	37.8%	100.0%	243	61.9%	12.0%	26.1%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	54.0%	10.1%	36.0%	100.0%	119	60.0%	13.8%	26.2%	100.0%
2-parent	137	53.0%	7.3%	39.7%	100.0%	130	66.2%	8.0%	25.8%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	58.0%	7.1%*	34.9%	100.0%	180	63.5%	13.7%	22.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	41.3%	15.4%*	43.3%	100.0%	63	57.5%	7.1%	35.4%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	57.0%	10.0%	33.0%	100.0%	154	69.4%	9.0%	21.6%	100.0%
White	96	46.9%	8.0%	45.1%	100.0%	89	49.1%	17.2%	33.8%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	37.4%	14.9%*	47.6%	100.0%	61	59.7%	8.6%	31.7%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	60.0%	6.7%*	33.3%	100.0%	133	59.8%	12.2%	28.1%	100.0%
Attended college	66	55.1%	9.5%	35.4%	100.0%	49	70.6%	15.8%	13.6%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	63.6%	13.8%*	22.7%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	57.9%	7.7%*	34.4%	100.0%

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level

10. CHILD’S ATTITUDE TOWARD DOING WELL IN SCHOOL

Exhibit V-10 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to a year ago, would you say that (focal child) cares more about doing well in school, cares less, or is about the same?” As indicated, 61.5 percent of Cohort One thought that their child cared more about doing well in school, 6.6 percent thought their child cared less, and 31.9 percent thought there was no change in their child. Of Cohort Two, 69 percent thought that their child cared more about doing well in school, 9.1 percent thought their child cared less, and 22 percent thought there was no change in their child.

In Cohort Two, respondents in one-parent families were significantly more likely than respondents in two-parent families to report that their child cared less about doing well in school. In both cohorts, there was not a major difference between working respondents and non-working respondents in perceptions about the child’s attitude. In both cohorts, blacks were more likely than whites to think that their child cared more about doing well in school.

EXHIBIT V-10
COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
(FOCAL CHILD) CARES MORE ABOUT DOING WELL IN SCHOOL,
CARES LESS OR IS ABOUT THE SAME?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	More	Less	Same	Total	N	More	Less	Same	Total
Overall	278	61.5%	6.6%	31.9%	100.0%	243	69.0%	9.1%	22.0%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	62.5%	8.8%	28.7%	100.0%	119	67.6%	11.5%*	20.9%	100.0%
2-parent	137	60.5%	4.4%	35.1%	100.0%	130	72.0%	3.6%*	24.4%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	64.8%	7.0%	28.1%	100.0%	180	69.4%	8.8%	21.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	53.3%	8.7%	38.0%	100.0%	63	67.8%	9.7%	22.5%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	67.4%	7.0%	25.7%	100.0%	154	75.4%	7.6%	17.0%	100.0%
White	96	52.2%	8.5%	39.3%	100.0%	89	58.0%	11.6%	30.5%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	47.7%	13.0%**	39.3%	100.0%	61	69.0%	8.2%	22.8%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	68.0%	3.5%**	28.5%	100.0%	133	69.2%	8.5%	22.3%	100.0%
Attended college	66	61.8%	11.1%**	27.2%	100.0%	49	68.4%	11.6%	20.0%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	71.4%	9.5%	19.2%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	63.2%	8.1%	28.7%	100.0%

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level ** Difference between persons who had completed high school only and all other respondents statistically significant at the .05 level.

11. CHILD’S HEALTH STATUS

Exhibit V-11 presents data on responses to the question: “Would you say that (focal child’s) health in general is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?” As indicated, 40.5 percent of Cohort One thought that their child’s health was excellent, and another 25.5 percent thought that their child’s health was very good. Of Cohort Two, 35.9 percent thought that their child’s health was excellent, and another 26.8 percent thought that their child’s health was very good. Employment status, ethnicity, and education did not have a consistent impact upon respondent perceptions of their child’s health.

EXHIBIT V-11
WOULD YOU SAY THAT (FOCAL CHILD'S) HEALTH IN GENERAL IS
EXCELLENT, VERY GOOD, GOOD, FAIR OR POOR?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One						Cohort Two					
	N	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Overall	278	40.5%	25.5%	25.5%	7.5%	1.0%	243	35.9%	26.8%	27.7%	9.6%	0.0%
Household type												
1-parent	141	39.4%	26.4%	26.9%	6.0%	1.3%	119	31.2%	28.9%	29.7%	10.2%	0.0%
2-parent	137	41.5%	24.7%	24.2%	8.9%	0.8%	130	45.6%	22.5%	23.6%	8.3%	0.0%
Employment Status												
Working	208	43.1%	26.3%	22.8%	7.1%	0.7%	180	35.3%	24.1%	33.0%	7.6%	0.0%
Not Working	71	31.5%	24.7%	35.3%	6.4%	2.1%	63	37.5%	34.2%	13.5%	14.8%	0.0%
Ethnicity												
Black	181	38.7%	23.9%	29.3%	6.8%	1.4%	154	31.6%	28.3%	31.3%	8.8%	0.0%
White	96	41.1%	30.0%	20.6%	7.5%	0.7%	89	24.5%	24.7%	21.8%	11.1%	0.0%
Education												
Did not complete high school	64	31.2%	23.2%	38.7%	5.5%	1.4%	61	34.6%	20.0%	29.0%	16.5%	0.0%
Completed high school only	150	38.9%	29.1%	25.1%	6.5%	0.4%	133	37.3%	25.6%	27.4%	9.6%	0.0%
Attended college	66	51.3%	20.8%	16.3%	9.2%	2.4%	49	33.3%	38.8%	27.1%	0.8%	0.0%
Age of Child												
5-12 years old							172	35.3%	29.5%	28.7%	6.5%	0.0%
13-17 years old							71	32.6%	27.5%	25.5%	14.5%	0.0%

12. CHANGES IN CHILD'S HEALTH

Exhibit V-12 presents data on responses to the question: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your (focal child’s) health is better, worse, or about the same?” As shown, 31.4 percent of Cohort One thought that their child’s health was better, and 1.4 percent thought that their child’s health was worse. Of Cohort Two, 45.4 percent thought that their child’s health was better, and 3.5 percent thought that their child’s health was worse. Employment status, ethnicity, and education were not consistently related to respondent perceptions about changes in children’s health.

**EXHIBIT V-12
 COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THAT
 (FOCAL CHILD'S) HEALTH IS BETTER, WORSE,
 OR ABOUT THE SAME? (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	Cohort One					Cohort Two				
	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total	N	Better	Worse	Same	Total
Overall	278	31.4%	1.4%	67.2%	100.0%	243	45.4%	3.5%	51.1%	100.0%
Household type										
1-parent	141	29.6%	1.9%	68.5%	100.0%	119	46.6%	3.8%	49.6%	100.0%
2-parent	137	33.2%	0.9%	66.0%	100.0%	130	42.9%	3.0%	54.2%	100.0%
Employment Status										
Working	208	31.1%	1.0%	67.8%	100.0%	180	46.8%	2.5%	50.8%	100.0%
Not Working	71	29.6%	3.0%	67.4%	100.0%	63	41.7%	6.5%	51.8%	100.0%
Ethnicity										
Black	181	32.5%	2.0%	65.5%	100.0%	154	51.2%	1.5%	47.3%	100.0%
White	96	28.1%	0.8%	71.1%	100.0%	89	35.3%	6.5%	58.2%	100.0%
Education										
Did not complete high school	64	35.3%	2.1%	62.7%	100.0%	61	34.6%	7.3%	58.2%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	29.6%	1.4%	69.0%	100.0%	133	48.3%	2.5%	49.2%	100.0%
Attended college	66	29.1%	1.4%	69.5%	100.0%	49	50.2%	2.1%	47.7%	100.0%
Age of Child										
5-12 years old						172	47.0%	1.9%	51.1%	100.0%
13-17 years old						71	42.3%	3.9%	53.8%	100.0%

13. REGULAR SOURCE OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE CHILD

Exhibit V-13 presents data on responses to the question: “Is there a place where (focal child) is usually taken for routine medical care, such as getting check-ups?” As shown, about 91 percent of Cohort One and 95 percent of Cohort Two reported that their child had a regular source of medical care. The respondents’ employment status, ethnicity, or education did not have a major impact on whether the child had a regular source of medical care

EXHIBIT V-13
IS THERE A PLACE WHERE (FOCAL CHILD) IS USUALLY TAKEN
FOR ROUTINE MEDICAL CARE, SUCH AS GETTING CHECK-UPS?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Characteristic	Cohort One				Cohort Two			
	N	Yes	No	Total	N	Yes	No	Total
Overall	278	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%	243	95.1%	4.9%	100.0%
Household type								
1-parent	141	89.7%	10.3%	100.0%	119	93.8%	6.2%	100.0%
2-parent	137	93.0%	7.0%	100.0%	130	97.8%	2.2%	100.0%
Employment Status								
Working	208	91.0%	9.0%	100.0%	180	96.6%	3.4%	100.0%
Not Working	71	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	63	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Ethnicity								
Black	181	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%	154	94.5%	5.5%	100.0%
White	96	93.4%	6.6%	100.0%	89	95.9%	4.1%	100.0%
Education								
Did not complete high school	64	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%	61	93.6%	6.4%	100.0%
Completed high school only	150	94.0%	6.0%	100.0%	133	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
Attended college	66	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	49	98.1%	1.9%	100.0%
Age of Child								
5-12 years old					172	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
13-17 years old					71	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%

D. QUALITY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AS A PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN

Exhibit V-14 presents data on responses to the question: “How would you rate the safety of your neighborhood as a place to raise children?” As indicated, 37.9 percent of Cohort One rated their neighborhood as very good, while 10.9 percent rated their neighborhood as not too good or very bad. Of Cohort Two, 36.3 percent rated their neighborhood as very good, while 11.9 percent rated their neighborhood as not too good or very bad. Whites were more likely than blacks to rate their neighborhood “very good.”

**EXHIBIT V-14
HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD
AS A PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN?
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Characteristic	N	Very Good	Good	Not too Good	Very Bad	Total	N	Very Good	Good	Not too Good	Very Bad	Total
Overall	278	37.9%	51.1%	10.7%	0.2%	100%	243	36.3%	51.8%	7.6%	4.3%	100%
Household type												
1-parent	141	37%	48.9%	14.1%	0%	100%	119	33.3%	53.8%	8.3%	4.6%	100%
2-parent	137	38.8%	53.2%	7.5%	0.4%	100%	130	42.4%	47.6%	6.2%	3.7%	100%
Employment Status												
Working	208	40%	47.6%	12.2%	0.2%	100%	180	32.2%	55.1%	7.8%	4.8%	100%
Not Working	71	30.8%	57.8%	11.4%	0%	100%	63	47.2%	42.7%	7.2%	3%	100%
Ethnicity												
Black	181	36.2%	48.9%	14.7%	0.2%	100%	154	30.5%	55.8%	9.2%	4.5%	100%
White	96	41.7%	50.7%	7.6%	0%	100%	89	44.1%	46.5%	5.3%	4.2%	100%
Education												
Did not complete high school	64	31.9%	55.8%	12.3%	0%	100%	61	38.7%	49.7%	11.5%	0%	100%
Completed high school only	150	42.3%	47.4%	10%	0.3%	100%	133	30.9%	58.4%	6.4%	4.3%	100%
Attended college	66	31.8%	51.6%	16.6%	0%	100%	49	49%	34.7%	6.4%	9.9%	100%

E. ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

As indicated above, the major goal of the analysis was to determine whether there was any evidence that leaving the Food Stamp Program was associated with negative child outcomes. Overall, less than 10 percent of the respondents in either sample reported that their child’s behavior, temperament, or school performance had worsened in the last year. Many of the respondents reported improvement in child behavior, temperament, and school performance, but this may have been due to normal child development or other factors. For several of the measures, child outcomes were better among employed respondents, blacks, more educated respondents, and two-parent families. However, the impact of these variables was not always consistent across the two cohorts.

In addition, the majority of respondents rated their child’s health as excellent or very good. Almost 41 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were still off Food Stamps rated their child’s health as excellent, and 26 percent rated it very good. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 36 percent and 27 percent. About 8 percent of Cohort One and 10 percent of Cohort Two rated their child’s health as fair or poor. Only 1.4 percent of Cohort One and 3.5 percent of Cohort Two rated their child’s health as being worse than a year ago. About 91

percent of the leavers in both cohorts reported that they had a regular source of medical care for their children.

In summary, the data on child behavior, school performance, and child well-being do not show evidence of any major negative trends in child outcomes among families who had left Food Stamps.

CHAPTER VI: PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, CHILD CARE, AND TRANSPORTATION AMONG FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on the following topics for respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys:

- receipt of public assistance and other sources of support after leaving Food Stamps;
- use of child care;
- receipt of assistance in using child care; and
- transportation situation.

A. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Receipt of Assistance, by Household Type

Exhibit VI-1 presents data on the receipt of public assistance and other sources of support by respondents, by household type. As indicated, 65.2 percent of Cohort One and 71.6 percent of Cohort Two were receiving Medicaid for themselves or a family member. However, only 58.7 percent of one-parent families from Cohort One were receiving Medicaid, compared to 72.2 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. Among Cohort Two, there was little difference between one-parent and two-parent cases.

Only 2.7 percent of Cohort One and 1.9 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were receiving assistance in paying for child care. Almost 27 percent of Cohort One reported that they were receiving child support, including 38.6 percent of the respondents from one-parent families. About 27 percent of Cohort Two reported receiving child support, including almost 33 percent of the one-parent cases. About 8.6 percent of Cohort One and 13.2 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were receiving SSI benefits.

Almost 22 percent of Cohort One and 15 percent of Cohort Two were participating in WIC. However, only 18.2 percent of one-parent families in Cohort One were participating, and only 15 percent of one-parent families from Cohort Two. Almost 47 percent of Cohort One and 54 percent of Cohort Two reported that they had children participating in the school lunch program.

About 10 percent of one-parent families from Cohort One and 13 percent of one-parent families from Cohort Two were in subsidized housing or public housing. About 10 percent of Cohort One and almost 14 percent of Cohort Two reported that they received financial assistance from family or friends on a regular basis. About 40 percent of Cohort One and 43 percent of Cohort Two reported that their children had received shots or vaccinations through the local health department.

**EXHIBIT VI-1
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY OR
SOMEONE IN THEIR HOME WERE RECEIVING SPECIFIC BENEFITS
OR SUPPORT, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Benefits/Support	Cohort One			Cohort Two		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	162	151	312	145	165	301
Cash assistance	1.2%	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Medicaid	58.7%	72.2%	65.2%	72.1%	70.5%	71.6%
Child care assistance	4.0%	1.3%	2.7%	1.9%	2.0%	1.9%
Child support	38.6%	14.3%	26.9%	32.6%	15.8%	27.2%
Social Security	11.0%	8.5%	9.8%	4.6%	9.4%	6.2%
SSI	9.3%	7.8%	8.6%	14.4%	10.5%	13.2%
Pension income	4.4%	2.2%	3.3%	1.4%	0.4%	1.1%
WIC	18.2%	25.7%	21.8%	15.0%	15.4%	15.1%
School lunch	52.4%	40.6%	46.7%	54.2%	55.0%	54.5%
Summer feeding program for children	5.1%	1.8%	3.5%	4.6%	1.7%	3.7%
Rent subsidy or public housing	10.3%	1.8%	6.2%	12.8%	4.1%	10.0%
Free housing from a parent or relative	7.8%	6.2%	7.0%	12.3%	5.7%	10.2%
Help in paying bills from family or friend living with you	7.1%	7.0%	7.0%	5.9%	1.7%	4.5%
Help in paying bills from family or friend not living with you	7.4%	7.6%	7.5%	16.2%	13.4%	15.3%
Gifts of money from family or friends	12.0%	8.3%	10.2%	14.9%	11.5%	13.8%
Shots or vaccinations from the health department	38.4%	42.0%	40.1%	47.2%	33.8%	42.9%
None	5.6%	2.3%	4.0%	4.0%	7.3%	5.1%

Receipt of Assistance, by Current Employment Status

Exhibit VI-2 presents data on the receipt of public assistance and other sources of support by respondents, by employment status. The data show that almost 71 percent of unemployed respondents in Cohort One were on Medicaid, compared to 59 percent of currently employed respondents. The figures for Cohort Two were 76 percent and 70 percent, respectively.

Only 3.9 percent of working respondents in Cohort One and 2.3 percent of working respondents in Cohort Two reported that they were receiving help with child care. About 34 percent of working respondents in Cohort One were receiving child support, compared to only 25 percent of non-working respondents. The figures for Cohort Two were 32 percent and 13 percent.

About 14 percent of non-working respondents in Cohort One were receiving SSI benefits, compared to only about 7 percent of working respondents. The percentages for Cohort Two were 28 percent and 8 percent.

Non-working respondents were more likely to be involved in the WIC program but less likely to be involved in the school lunch program. Non-working respondents were much more likely than working respondents to be receiving help from family members and friends in paying bills. Working respondents were more likely than non-working respondents to report that their children had received shots or vaccinations from the health department.

EXHIBIT VI-2
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY OR
SOMEONE IN THEIR HOME WERE RECEIVING SPECIFIC BENEFITS
OR SUPPORT, BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Benefits/Support	Cohort One		Cohort Two	
	Working	Not Working	Working	Not Working
N	226	91	220	81
Cash assistance	0.0%	3.1%	0.8%	0.0%
Medicaid	59.4%	70.8%	69.8%	76.5%
Child care assistance	3.9%	1.6%	2.3%	0.9%
Child support	34.2%	24.8%	32.3%	13.3%
Social Security	7.2%	17.8%	5.2%	8.9%
SSI	6.8%	14.1%	7.8%	27.8%
Pension income	3.9%	3.3%	0.7%	2.2%
WIC	18.8%	24.4%	12.1%	23.6%
School lunch	51.8%	42.0%	58.2%	44.3%
Summer feeding program for children	3.4%	6.0%	4.0%	2.7%
Rent subsidy or public housing	8.4%	6.6%	10.6%	8.4%
Free housing from a parent or relative	7.0%	7.9%	8.8%	13.9%
Help in paying bills from family or friend living with you	7.0%	7.1%	4.7%	4.0%
Help in paying bills from family or friend not living with you	5.9%	11.4%	14.0%	18.8%
Gifts of money from family or friends	10.8%	11.3%	13.6%	14.4%
Shots or vaccinations from the health department	41.9%	33.2%	45.5%	35.8%
None	5.7%	1.9%	5.0%	5.1%

Receipt of Assistance, by Reported Household Income

Exhibit VI-3 presents data on the receipt of public assistance and other sources of support by respondents, by reported household income. The data show that about 66 to 71 percent of Cohort One respondents with monthly incomes below \$1,000 were on Medicaid, compared to 49 percent of those with incomes of \$2,000 per month or more. Among Cohort Two, income had less impact upon the use of Medicaid.

About 37 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had household incomes of \$500 per month or less were receiving child support, compared to only 22 percent of those with incomes of \$501 to \$999 per month. In Cohort Two, persons with higher incomes were more likely than lower-income persons to be receiving child support.

Only 20 percent of Cohort One respondents with household incomes of \$500 per month or less were participating in WIC. However, 55 percent of these families had children who were involved in the school lunch program. Among Cohort Two, the lower-income respondents were less likely to be participating in the school lunch program. Respondents with household incomes below \$500 per month were the most likely to report that they received financial support from family or friends not living with them.

EXHIBIT VI-3-A
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY OR
SOMEONE IN THEIR HOME WERE RECEIVING SPECIFIC BENEFITS
OR SUPPORT, BY REPORTED HOUSEHOLD INCOME,
COHORT ONE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

Benefits/Support	\$0-\$500	\$501-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000+
N	38	99	85	31	33
Cash Assistance	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medicaid	66.3%	71.1%	69.2%	58.6%	49.5%
Child care assistance	0.0%	2.1%	3.8%	4.4%	4.7%
Child support	37.4%	22.4%	36.4%	39.0%	27.4%
Social Security	10.8%	15.3%	7.9%	10.8%	6.4%
SSI	8.6%	9.5%	11.9%	11.8%	5.0%
Pension income	0.0%	5.4%	0.5%	6.1%	2.4%
WIC	20.4%	25.1%	22.9%	20.3%	19.0%
School lunch	55.5%	36.8%	59.8%	55.7%	37.7%
Summer feeding program for children	2.2%	5.9%	4.7%	1.8%	6.3%
Rent subsidy or public housing	17.0%	9.0%	10.3%	3.5%	4.7%
Free housing from a parent or relative	8.5%	11.1%	5.2%	4.8%	2.4%
Help in paying bills from family or friend living with you	9.7%	5.4%	5.9%	2.5%	11.1%
Help in paying bills from family or friend not living with you	19.3%	7.5%	9.0%	7.0%	1.6%
Gifts of money from family or friends	13.4%	14.4%	16.8%	4.5%	4.3%
Shots or vaccinations from the health department	43.4%	33.5%	36.9%	54.1%	39.6%
None	0.0%	8.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.9%

**EXHIBIT VI-3-B
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY OR
SOMEONE IN THEIR HOME WERE RECEIVING SPECIFIC BENEFITS
OR SUPPORT, BY REPORTED HOUSEHOLD INCOME,
COHORT TWO (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Benefits/Support	\$0-\$500	\$501-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000+
N	33	77	96	40	34
Cash Assistance	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Medicaid	77.2%	70.3%	71.9%	76.1%	67.3%
Child care assistance	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	5.2%	5.3%
Child support	20.3%	25.1%	26.9%	40.8%	38.8%
Social Security	0.0%	5.5%	6.5%	4.4%	15.9%
SSI	5.6%	21.1%	10.8%	6.7%	16.0%
Pension income	0.0%	2.3%	1.1%	0.0%	1.3%
WIC	21.6%	6.7%	17.9%	16.5%	12.7%
School lunch	39.5%	58.0%	60.9%	50.8%	55.9%
Summer feeding program for children	2.3%	1.3%	4.5%	3.7%	10.6%
Rent subsidy or public housing	9.6%	16.7%	7.4%	7.1%	6.6%
Free housing from a parent or relative	27.6%	9.9%	9.5%	4.5%	1.3%
Help in paying bills from family or friend living with you	3.2%	4.6%	1.7%	4.5%	10.6%
Help in paying bills from family or friend not living with you	29.4%	20.1%	14.4%	8.2%	11.9%
Gifts of money from family or friends	17.9%	30.7%	3.8%	8.9%	11.4%
Shots or vaccinations from the health department	30.3%	49.6%	45.7%	47.5%	39.2%
None	5.6%	2.3%	3.4%	0.0%	7.3%

B. CHILD CARE USE AND PAYMENTS

Number of Pre-School and School-Age Children

Exhibit VI-4 presents data on the number of pre-school children in the respondents’ families, by household type. As indicated, about 67 percent of Cohort One had no pre-school children, including almost 74 percent of the respondents from one-parent families. Almost 63 percent of Cohort Two had no pre-school children, including 66 percent of the one-parent cases. On average, respondents from two-parent families had a larger number of pre-school children than respondents from one-parent families. For example, 12.8 percent of the two-parent respondents in Cohort One had two or more pre-school children, compared to only 4.2 percent of the respondents from one-parent families.

Exhibit VI-5 shows the percentage of respondents who had school-age children. The data indicate that only 16.9 percent of Cohort One had no school-age children. About 47 percent of Cohort One had two or more school-age children. About 19 percent of Cohort Two had no school-age children.

EXHIBIT VI-4
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITH PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Number of Pre-School Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	339
None	73.9%*	61.1%*	67.3%
One	22.0%	26.1%	24.1%
Two	4.2%*	10.4%*	7.3%
Three +	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of Pre-School Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	144	169	304
None	66.5%*	54.6%*	62.6%
One	29.2%	31.5%	29.9%
Two	3.4%*	11.8%*	6.1%
Three +	0.9%	2.2%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were statistically significant at the .05 level

EXHIBIT VI-5
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITH SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Number of School-Age Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	339
None	15.2%	20.6%	16.9%
One	40.5%*	25.5%*	35.8%
Two	29.4%	32.6%	30.4%
Three +	14.9%	21.3%	16.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of School-Age Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	144	170	303
None	17.7%	22.5%	19.3%
One	40.1%	34.2%	38.2%
Two	27.9%	22.9%	26.3%
Three +	13.3%	20.5%	16.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Child Care for School-Age Children

Exhibit VI-6 presents data on the percentage of respondents who reported that they used before-school or after-school child care for their school-age children. As shown in the exhibit, 17.9 percent of Cohort One respondents with school-age children reported that they used before-school or after-school child care, including one-quarter of the respondents from one-parent families, but only 11 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. About 24 percent of Cohort Two respondents with school-age children were using child care for these children.

EXHIBIT VI-6 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS USING BEFORE-SCHOOL OR AFTER-SCHOOL CARE FOR THEIR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Use Before-School or After-School Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	141	137	278
Yes	24.5%*	11.1%*	17.9%
	Cohort Two		
Use Before-School or After-School Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	119	132	245
Yes	27.1%	17.2%	24.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Type of Child Care for School-Age Children

In terms of the type of providers being used by respondents who were using child care for their pre-school children, about 51 percent of Cohort One and 54 percent of Cohort Two were using “informal” child care provided by a friend or relative. The percentage of respondents who were using informal child care did not vary greatly by household type. In Cohort One, the respondents from one-parent families were much more likely to be using child care centers than respondents from two-parent families. In Cohort Two, there was no difference. In Cohort One, respondents from two-parent families were more likely than respondents from one-parent families to be using family day care homes, churches, and schools. This was not the case for Cohort Two.

Payment for School-Age Child Care

Exhibit VI-7 shows that, in Cohort One, 64 percent of the respondents who were using child care for their school-age children were paying for the child care. For Cohort Two, the

percentage was 65 percent. For Cohort One, the percentage was much higher among the respondents from two-parent families.

EXHIBIT VI-7
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING BEFORE-OR-AFTER CARE FOR
THEIR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN – PERCENT WHO WERE PAYING
FOR THE CARE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Pay for the Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	35	15	50
Yes	57.9%	77.3%	63.9%
	Cohort Two		
Pay for the Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	32	23	59
Yes	64.6%	67.7%	65.3%

Help in Paying for School-Age Child Care

Exhibit VI-8 indicates that, of the Cohort One respondents who were paying for school-age child care, 8.7 percent were receiving help from the state in paying for the care. For Cohort Two, the percentage was 9.2 percent.

For those respondents who were paying for school-age child care but not getting help, Exhibit VI-9 shows the reasons given for not getting assistance. Of the Cohort One respondents, 31 percent did not know they could get help. About 21 percent did not want the hassle, and 3.4 percent said that the provider did not want to deal with the program requirements. Of Cohort Two respondents who were not getting help, almost 38 percent said they did not know they could get help. About 32 percent of Cohort One and 27 percent of Cohort Two said that they had applied for assistance but had been found ineligible.

**EXHIBIT VI-8
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE PAYING FOR BEFORE-OR-AFTER CARE
FOR THEIR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN – PERCENT
WHO WERE RECEIVING HELP IN PAYING
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Receive Help in Paying for Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	20	11	31
Yes	12.7%	0.0%	8.7%
	Cohort Two		
Receive Help in Paying for Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	21	16	39
Yes	10.5%	4.8%	9.2%

**EXHIBIT VI-9
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE PAYING FOR BEFORE-OR-AFTER CARE
FOR THEIR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN BUT WERE NOT RECEIVING
HELP – REASONS FOR NOT GETTING HELP
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Reasons for Not Getting Help	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	30	35
Did not know I could get help	31.3%	37.8%
Applied but was told I was not eligible	32.0%	26.6%
Do not want the hassle	21.0%	21.7%
Provider does not want to meet requirements	3.4%	0.0%
Told no funds available	0.0%	6.4%
Recently applied/waiting to hear	1.5%	0.0%
Do not need help	2.6%	4.2%
Don't know	10.9%	2.1%

Child Care for Pre-School Children

Exhibit VI-9 indicates that 51.6 percent of the Cohort One respondents with pre-school children were using child care for these children. The figure for Cohort Two was 64.8 percent. Respondents from one-parent families were much more likely than two-parent cases to be using child care for their pre-school children.

**EXHIBIT VI-10
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS USING CHILD CARE
FOR THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Use Child Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	43	67	111
Yes	71.1%*	38.9%*	51.6%
	Cohort Two		
Use Child Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	49	77	113
Yes	74.2%*	50.6%*	64.8%

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples were statistically significant at the .05 level

Type of Provider for Pre-School Child Care

For respondents who were using child care for their pre-school children, Exhibit VI-11 shows the type of child care provider being used. As indicated, almost 41 percent of Cohort One were using a child care center, including 45 percent of the respondents from one-parent families. Only 25 percent of the Cohort Two were using a child care center.

Overall, 51 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were using child care for their pre-school children were using informal child care in the form of a friend or relative, including 39 percent of the respondents from one-parent families and 64.6 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. Of the Cohort Two respondents who were using child care for their pre-school children, 59 percent were using informal child care.

**EXHIBIT VI-11
TYPE OF PROVIDER USED BY RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING
CHILD CARE FOR THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Type of Provider	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	31	26	57
School	16.6%	0.0%	5.7%
Friend	6.5%	22.9%	14.0%
Relative	33.0%	41.7%	37.0%
Child care center	45.3%	35.4%	40.7%
Family or group day care	4.7%	0.0%	2.6%
	Cohort Two		
Type of Provider	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	36	39	73
School	2.0%	6.5%	3.4%
Friend	25.2%	7.0%	19.6%
Relative	41.4%	35.0%	39.4%
Child care center	23.7%	29.0%	25.4%
Family or group day care	7.6%	17.3%	10.6%
Church	0.0%	1.9%	0.6%
Other	0.0%	3.3%	1.0%

Number of Children in the Pre-School Group

For respondents who were using formal child care for their pre-school child(ren), Exhibit VI-12 shows the number of children usually in the child’s room or group. As indicated in the exhibit, 21.5 percent of the respondents in Cohort One reported that their child’s room or group involved 20 or more children, and another 30.5 percent reported that the room or group involved 11 to 20 children. Of Cohort Two, only 5.9 percent reported that their child’s room or group involved 20 or more children, while 50 percent reported that their child’s group involved 11 to 19 children. Respondents from one-parent families reported fewer children in their child’s room or group compared to respondents from two-parent families.

**EXHIBIT VI-12
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING FORMAL CHILD CARE FOR
THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – NUMBER OF CHILDREN
USUALLY IN THE CHILD’S ROOM OR GROUP
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Number of Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	16	9	25
5 or less	18.0%	0.0%	11.5%
6-10	49.5%	13.7%	36.5%
11-19	15.8%	56.8%	30.5%
20+	16.9%	29.5%	21.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
	12	22	32
5 or less	0.0%	8.8%	3.9%
6-10	50.0%	26.5%	39.8%
11-19	43.9%	58.9%	50.5%
20+	6.1%	5.6%	5.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Formal child care is care provided by someone other than a friend or relative

Ratio of Children to Adults in Formal Pre-School Child Care

For respondents who were using formal child care for their pre-school child(ren), Exhibit VI-13 shows the ratio of children to adults in the child’s room or group. As shown in the exhibit, 43 percent of Cohort One reported that the ratio was 5-to-1 or less, and about 54 percent reported that it was between 6-to-1 and 10-to-1. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 35 percent and 43 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT VI-13
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING FORMAL CHILD CARE FOR
THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – RATIO OF CHILDREN TO ADULTS
IN THE CHILD’S ROOM OR GROUP
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Ratio of Children to Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	16	9	25
5:1 or less	42.7%	43.2%	42.9%
6:1 to 10:1	52.8%	56.8%	54.3%
More than 10:1	4.5%	0.0%	2.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Ratio of Children to Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	12	22	32
5:1 or less	28.8%	43.5%	35.2%
6:1 to 10:1	43.9%	41.1%	42.7%
More than 10:1	27.3%	15.4%	22.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Formal child care is care provided by someone other than a friend or relative

Arrangements for Informal Pre-School Child Care

For respondents who were using informal child care for their pre-school children, Exhibit VI-14 shows the number of children usually in the child care arrangement. As indicated, 35.7 percent of Cohort One respondents who used informal pre-school care reported that three or more children were in the child care arrangement. For Cohort Two, the figure was only about 12 percent.

Exhibit VI-15 shows the ratio of children to adults in the child care arrangements for respondents who used informal pre-school child care. As indicated, 59 percent of Cohort One and 61 percent of Cohort Two reported that their children were in arrangements involving one adult per child.

**EXHIBIT VI-14
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING INFORMAL CHILD CARE FOR
THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – NUMBER OF CHILDREN
USUALLY CARED FOR IN THE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENT
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Number of Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	12	17	29
1	53.7%	54.8%	54.3%
2	6.0%	13.0%	10.0%
3+	40.3%	32.2%	35.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of Children	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	25	17	43
1	60.6%	52.2%	58.7%
2	28.8%	31.1%	29.3%
3+	10.6%	16.7%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Informal child care is care provided by a friend or relative

**EXHIBIT VI-15
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING INFORMAL CHILD CARE FOR
THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – RATIO OF CHILDREN TO ADULTS
IN THE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENT
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Ratio of Children to Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	12	17	29
1:1 or less	51.7%	66.5%	59.4%
1:1 to 5:1	48.3%	26.8%	37.1%
More than 5:1	0.0%	6.7%	3.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Ratio of Children to Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	25	17	43
1:1 or less	63.6%	52.2%	61.1%
1:1 to 5:1	25.8%	31.1%	26.9%
More than 5:1	10.6%	16.7%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Informal child care is care provided by a friend or relative

Paying for Pre-School Child Care

For respondents who were using pre-school child care, Exhibit VI-16 shows the percentage who were paying for the care. As indicated, 63 percent of Cohort One and almost 81 percent of Cohort Two were paying for the care.

For those who were paying for pre-school child care, Exhibit VI-17 shows the percentage who were receiving help. As indicated, 7 percent of Cohort One and 6 percent of Cohort Two said that they were receiving help paying for care.

For those who were paying for pre-school child care but were not receiving help, Exhibit VI-18 shows the reasons given for not getting help. As indicated, 35 percent of Cohort One and 32 percent of Cohort Two had applied but been found ineligible. Almost 20 percent of Cohort One and 39 percent of Cohort Two said that they did not know they could get help.

**EXHIBIT VI-16
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE USING CHILD CARE FOR THEIR PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – PERCENT WHO WERE PAYING FOR THE CARE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Pay for the Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	31	26	57
Yes	65.3%	61.1%	63.4%
	Cohort Two		
Pay for the Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	36	39	73
Yes	83.3%	74.8%	80.7%

**EXHIBIT VI-17
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE PAYING FOR CHILD CARE FOR THEIR
PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN – PERCENT WHO
WERE RECEIVING HELP IN PAYING
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Receive Help in Paying for Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	20	15	35
Yes	6.3%	8.6%	7.3%
	Cohort Two		
Receive Help in Paying for Care?	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	30	28	60
Yes	6.7%	4.4%	6.0%

**EXHIBIT VI-18
RESPONDENTS WHO WERE PAYING FOR CHILD CARE FOR THEIR
PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN BUT WERE NOT RECEIVING HELP –
REASONS FOR NOT GETTING HELP
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Reasons for Not Getting Help	Cohort One (n=34)	Cohort Two (n=56)
Did not know I could get help	19.7%	39.0%
Applied but was told I was not eligible	35.5%	32.1%
Do not want the hassle	15.8%	9.3%
Provider does not want to meet requirements	5.1%	0.8%
Told no money available	0.0%	4.8%
Do not need help	0.0%	2.6%
Recently applied/waiting to hear	8.0%	0.0%
Don't know	7.8%	11.9%
Other	8.0%	0.0%

C. TRANSPORTATION

Type of Transportation Used by Respondents

Exhibit VI-19 shows the types of transportation used by respondents to get around. The data show that 79 percent of Cohort One respondents from two-parent families used their own vehicle, compared to 56 percent of the respondents from one-parent families. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 79 percent and 65 percent. About a quarter of the Cohort One

respondents from one-parent families relied upon rides from friends or family to get around, as did 20 percent of the one-parent cases in Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT VI-19
TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION USED BY RESPONDENTS
- BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

How Do You Get Around?	Cohort One		Cohort Two	
	1-parent	2-parent	1-parent	2-parent
N	166	173	145	169
Use own vehicle	56.4%	79.5%	65.2%	78.6%
Ride with a relative, friend, neighbor	25.5%	11.7%	19.6%	13.1%
Borrow vehicle	8.3%	5.8%	8.3%	7.1%
Bus	5.7%	3.0%	4.8%	0.0%
Taxi	2.1%	0.0%	4.0%	1.2%
Walk	1.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
Ride bicycle	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Payment for Transportation

Exhibit VI-20 shows that, among Cohort One respondents who used their own vehicle or a ride share or who borrowed a vehicle, 90 percent of the respondents from one-parent families and 94 percent of the families from two-parent families paid something toward gas or upkeep of the vehicle. The percentages for Cohort Two were 93 percent and 95 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT VI-20
RESPONDENTS WHO USED THEIR OWN VEHICLE A RIDE SHARE,
OR BORROWED VEHICLE - PERCENT WHO PAID ANYTHING FOR
GAS OR UPKEEP (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Pay Anything for Gas or Upkeep?	Cohort One	
	1-parent	2-parent
N	151	169
Yes	90.4%	94.3%
No	9.6%	5.7%
Pay Anything for Gas or Upkeep?	Cohort Two	
	1-parent	2-parent
N	135	168
Yes	93.4%	95.4%
No	6.6%	4.6%

APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL ANALYSES OF CHILD OUTCOMES AMONG FAMILIES WHO WERE STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This appendix presents additional analyses of the findings on child outcomes for families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. The additional analyses involve the use of a “child outcomes index.” This index is designed to combine the responses to all of the child outcome questions into a single numerical measure for each case. The index provides an overall measure for each respondent, combining the different dimensions of child behavior, temperament, and attitude.

A. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHILD OUTCOMES INDEX

To construct the child outcome index, we assigned scores to the responses to the 10 child outcome questions shown earlier in Chapter V. The questions relating to the child’s health were not included in the index. A score of 100 was assigned for a positive outcome; a score of 50 was assigned for a neutral outcome; and a score of 0 was assigned for a negative outcome.

For example, the first question on child outcomes was as follows: “Compared to one year ago, would you say that your child gets along better with other children, gets along worse, or is about the same?” If the respondent answered “better” to this question, a score of 100 was assigned to the case. If the respondent answered “the same,” a score of 50 was assigned. If the respondent answered “worse,” a score of 0 was assigned. An exception had to be made for the question that asked about how well the child had been doing with schoolwork. This question had five response options, which were scored as follows:

- very well -- 100,
- well --75,
- average -- 50,
- below average: -- 25, and
- not well at all -- 0.

Under this approach, a “perfect score” on the index was 100 (a score of 100 for each of the 10 questions). The average score on the index for all respondents was 69.3.

B. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Differences Based on Household Type

- As indicated in Exhibit A-1, the scores on the child outcomes index did not vary greatly by household type, although the average score was slightly higher for respondents from two-parent families.

**EXHIBIT A-1
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

Strata	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
1-parent	68.8	69.6
2-parent	70.3	71.9

Child Outcomes by Ethnicity

- As indicated in Exhibit A-2, the average score on the index was somewhat higher for blacks than for whites.
- Exhibit A-3 shows that this was true regardless of household type.

**EXHIBIT A-2
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE,
BY ETHNICITY OF THE RESPONDENT**

Ethnicity	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Black	70.3	72.8
White	67.4	66.0

**EXHIBIT A-3
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE,
BY ETHNICITY AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Ethnicity	1-parent	2-parent
Black	69.8	72.2
White	65.9	68.9
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Ethnicity	1-parent	2-parent
Black	72.7	73.2
White	62.4	70.7

Child Outcomes by Age of the Respondent

- As indicated in Exhibit A-4, the average score on the index for 1998-1999 leavers was higher for parents aged 18-29 than for older parents. This may reflect the impact of the child's age. Among 1999-2000 leavers, age had less of an impact, but the score was still highest for respondents aged 18-24.
- Exhibit A-5 shows that 1998-1999 leavers aged 40 and over had the lowest average score, regardless of household type. Among 1999-2000 leavers, the impact of age was less clear.

EXHIBIT A-4 CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
18-24 years old	73.4	73.3
25-29 years old	74.2	69.0
30-34 years old	69.9	70.1
35-39 years old	69.0	69.2
40+ years old	65.2	71.7

EXHIBIT A-5 CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY AGE OF RESPONDENT AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Age	1-parent	2-parent
18-24 years old	69.6	81.4
25-29 years old	76.3	70.4
30-34 years old	69.3	71.2
35-39 years old	68.8	69.7
40+ years old	63.6	68.1
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Age	1-parent	2-parent
18-24 years old	73.9	71.4
25-29 years old	68.1	71.0
30-34 years old	70.4	69.5
35-39 years old	67.9	72.3
40+ years old	69.4	75.8

Child Outcomes by Education

- As indicated in Exhibits A-6 and A-7, the average score on the index for 1998-1999 leavers was lowest for respondents who had not completed high school. Among 1999-2000 leavers, education had no impact.

**EXHIBIT A-6
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE,
BY EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT**

Education	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Did not complete high school	61.3	69.5
Completed high school	72.5	70.7
Attended college	69.6	70.2

**EXHIBIT A-7
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT
AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Education	1-parent	2-parent
Did not complete high school	59.8	64.2
Completed high school	72.9	71.5
Attended college	67.4	74.4
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Education	1-parent	2-parent
Did not complete high school	70.6	67.0
Completed high school	69.5	73.7
Attended college	68.6	73.1

Child Outcomes and Employment Status

- As shown in Exhibits A-8 and A-9, the average score on the index among 1998-1999 leavers was much higher for employed respondents than for non-working respondents. Among 1999-2000 leavers, employment status had no impact.

**EXHIBIT A-8
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE,
BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

Employment Status	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Working	71.6	70.1
Not working	62.4	71.0

**EXHIBIT A-9
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Employment Status	1-parent	2-parent
Working	70.8	73.9
Not working	61.7	63.3
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Employment Status	1-parent	2-parent
Working	69.7	71.2
Not working	69.3	73.0

Child Outcomes and Non-Traditional Work Hours

- Exhibits A-10 and A-11 show that, contrary to what might be expected, the average score on the index among 1998-1999 leavers was slightly higher for respondents who worked early morning or evening hours than for respondents who worked traditional schedules.
- Among 1999-2000 leavers, work hours had no impact on the child index.

**EXHIBIT A-10
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE BY WORK SCHEDULE**

Schedule	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Begin work before 6 a.m. or end work after 6 p.m.	74.0	69.9
Work between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.	70.6	70.5

**EXHIBIT A-11
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WORK SCHEDULE
AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Schedule	1-parent	2-parent
Begin work before 6 a.m. or end work after 6 p.m.	73.4	75.6
Work between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.	69.9	72.3
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Schedule	1-parent	2-parent
Begin work before 6 a.m. or end work after 6 p.m.	68.8	73.2
Work between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.	70.3	71.0

- Exhibit A-12 shows that, among 1998-1999 leavers, having to work weekends did not have a consistent impact upon the average child outcomes index score among respondents.
- Among 1999-2000 leavers, those who rarely worked weekends actually had the lowest score on the index.
- However, as indicated in Exhibit A-13, having to work weekends did have an impact on the index score for 1998-1999 leavers from two-parent families. However, the impact was the reverse for 1999-2000 leavers.

**EXHIBIT A-12
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER
THE RESPONDENT WORKED WEEKENDS**

Schedule	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Every weekend	71.4	73.2
Most weekends	69.9	69.3
Occasionally	75.6	69.2
Rarely	72.3	62.9

**EXHIBIT A-13
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS
WORKED WEEKENDS AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
	1-parent	2-parent
Every weekend	73.5	65.0
Most weekends	70.0	78.6
Occasionally	66.5	71.9
Rarely	60.0	95.0
	1999-2000 Leavers	
	1-parent	2-parent
Every weekend	73.4	72.7
Most weekends	67.9	75.3
Occasionally	69.8	68.5
Rarely	64.4	58.1

Child Outcomes and Child Care Access

- Exhibits A-14 to A-17 show that the index score was not greatly affected by whether respondents had ever needed child care in the past 12 months but could not find it or pay for it.

**EXHIBIT A-14
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER THE RESPONDENT
HAD EVER NEEDED REGULAR CHILD CARE IN THE PAST YEAR
BUT COULD NOT FIND IT**

Past Experience	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Could not find child care	68.7	68.0
Could find child care	69.6	71.0

**EXHIBIT A-15
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS
HAD EVER NEEDED CHILD CARE IN THE PAST YEAR BUT COULD
NOT FIND IT AND BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Past Experience	1-parent	2-parent
Could not find child care	67.9	70.4
Could find child care	69.1	70.3
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Past Experience	1-parent	2-parent
Could not find child care	66.1	75.0
Could find child care	70.9	71.3

**EXHIBIT A-16
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER THE RESPONDENT
HAD EVER NEEDED REGULAR CHILD CARE IN THE PAST YEAR
BUT COULD NOT PAY FOR IT**

Past Experience	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Could not pay for child care	67.8	67.8
Could pay for child care	69.8	71.1

**EXHIBIT A-17
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS
HAD EVER NEEDED CHILD CARE IN THE PAST YEAR BUT COULD
NOT PAY FOR IT AND BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Past Experience	1-parent	2-parent
Could not pay for child care	66.2	70.6
Could pay for child care	69.7	70.2
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Past Experience	1-parent	2-parent
Could not pay for child care	67.1	69.9
Could pay for child care	70.4	72.3

Child Outcomes by Safety of Neighborhood as a Place to Raise Children

- Exhibits A-18 to A-19 show that, in the 1998-1999 leavers sample, the index score was higher among respondents who rated their neighborhoods as very good or good. Among the 1999-2000 leavers, the relationship was less clear.

**EXHIBIT A-18
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY PERCEIVED QUALITY OF
NEIGHBORHOOD AS A PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN**

Neighborhood	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Very good	71.6	72.0
Good	69.4	70.5
Not too good	61.4	61.5
Very bad	-	71.5

**EXHIBIT A-19
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY PERCEIVED QUALITY OF
NEIGHBORHOOD AS A PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN
AND BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Neighborhood	1-parent	2-parent
Very good	71.7	71.4
Good	69.1	69.9
Not too good	61.0	63.6
Very bad	-	-
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Neighborhood	1-parent	2-parent
Very good	69.9	75.4
Good	70.4	70.6
Not too good	62.8	58.3
Very bad	70.5	73.9

Child Outcomes and Family Mobility

- Exhibits A-20 to A-21 show that the index score did not vary consistently by whether the respondent had moved in the past 12 months.

**EXHIBIT A-20
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER RESPONDENT
MOVED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS**

Moved?	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Yes	72.6	69.5
No	69.4	70.0

**EXHIBIT A-21
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX SCORE, BY WHETHER RESPONDENT
MOVED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS AND BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Moved?	1-parent	2-parent
Yes	71.9	74.2
No	69.8	68.6
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Moved?	1-parent	2-parent
Yes	69.8	68.8
No	68.7	72.6

Child Outcomes and Respondents' Views of Life After Food Stamps

- Exhibits A-22 and A-23 show that respondents who had a more positive view of life since leaving Food Stamps had higher scores on the child outcomes index. For example, 1998-1999 leavers who agreed that life was better than a year ago had an average score of 70.8, compared to a score of only 60.3 for those who disagreed that life was better than a year ago. The same pattern was true for the 1999-2000 leavers.
- Likewise, respondents who agreed that they felt more stress than a year ago had lower average scores than respondents who disagreed that they felt more stress.

**EXHIBIT A-22
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX BY RESPONDENT VIEWS OF LIFE
SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS**

	1998-1999 Leavers	
Statement	Agree	Disagree
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	70.8	60.3
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	67.9	71.1
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	65.7	72.2
	1999-2000 Leavers	
Statement	Agree	Disagree
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	72.1	60.7
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	67.8	73.1
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	67.0	73.8

**EXHIBIT A-23
CHILD OUTCOME INDEX BY RESPONDENT VIEWS OF LIFE
SINCE LEAVING FOOD STAMPS AND BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

	1998-1999 Leavers		
Statement	Response	1-parent	2-parent
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	69.9	72.8
	Disagree	62.5	54.6
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	67.7	68.3
	Disagree	70.2	73.2
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	65.5	66.0
	Disagree	71.5	74.0
	1999-2000 Leavers		
Statement	Response	1-parent	2-parent
You feel better about yourself than a year ago	Agree	72.2	71.9
	Disagree	58.1	71.3
You worry more about your family now than a year ago	Agree	66.9	69.9
	Disagree	72.6	74.0
You feel more stress now than you did a year ago	Agree	65.8	70.0
	Disagree	73.9	73.7

APPENDIX B: ADMINISTRATIVE DATA ON THE SURVEY SAMPLE

This Appendix presents data from administrative records systems on employment status, Food Stamp participation, TANF participation, and Medicaid participation among the survey sample. The data on employment status are based on a match against the Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage record system in South Carolina. To make the administrative data comparable to the survey data, we applied the sample weights to the strata, as in the survey analysis.

A. OBJECTIVES OF THE ANALYSIS

The administrative records data provide information on all members of the sample, regardless of whether they responded to the surveys. On a general level, therefore, the administrative records data allow us to determine whether the results of the surveys hold true for all members of the sample.

It should be noted, however, that there are some limitations to comparing the administrative records data with the survey data. First, most of the survey results presented in the report examine the status of families who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. In contrast, the administrative records data presented in this appendix include all members of the samples, including persons who were back on Food Stamps at the time of the surveys. Second, there are a number of limitations in comparing employment and earnings data from the surveys with data from the UI wage records. These differences are reviewed in the next section.

In the sections that follow, we present the administrative records data on the two samples of leavers. In Section F, we review the major findings from the administrative records data as they relate to the survey results.

B. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION FROM THE UI WAGE RECORDS SYSTEM

For the analysis, the South Carolina Department of Social Services conducted a match of the persons in the survey samples against the South Carolina UI wage records system. It should be noted that the UI wage records system has two major limitations as a source of information on employment patterns, as follows:

- The wage records contain information only on persons who are working in South Carolina. Sample members who have left the state and may be employed elsewhere cannot be tracked through the state's wage records system.
- The UI wage record system can be used to track persons in UI-covered employment. Employment in jobs that are not covered by the UI system cannot be tracked through the wage records.

For these reasons, a UI wage record match will tend to understate the percentage of sample members who are employed. The disparity may increase over time as more sample members leave South Carolina.

Another issue with the UI wage record data is that the data are based on quarterly earnings. This poses a challenge in terms of comparing the UI wage record information with the results of the survey data. Specifically, the surveys gathered information on the employment status of the respondent on the day when they were surveyed. In contrast, the UI data show only whether the person was employed at any time during a specific quarter. For persons who are sporadically employed in a specific quarter, it is possible that the UI wage records will show higher rates of employment than the survey data.

Overall Employment Patterns Among the Sample After Leaving Food Stamps, by Case Type

- Exhibit B-1 presents the results of the UI wage record match for all sample members for the period after they left Food Stamps. These include persons who were still off Food Stamps and those who had returned. It also includes persons who did not respond to the survey.
- The data indicate that about 68.7 percent of the 1998-1999 leavers had UI wages during the first quarter after leaving Food Stamps. This percentage declined somewhat to 65 percent in the 4th quarter after leaving Food Stamps, and to 61 percent in the 8th quarter.
- Of the 1999-2000 leavers, about 66 percent were employed when they left Food Stamps. This declined to 56 percent in the 4th quarter after leaving. It should be noted that the decline in the employment rate to 56 percent may be partly due to incomplete reporting by employer during the time frame of the study.
- Among the 1998-1999 leavers, UI employment rates were higher among one-parent cases than among two-parent cases. Among the 1999-2000 leavers, there was little difference between one-parent and two-parent cases.

EXHIBIT B-1 PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WITH UI WAGES AFTER LEAVING FOOD STAMPS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE

Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter left Food Stamps	74.7%	70.5%	54.8%	55.6%	68.7%	66.1%
First quarter	74.0%	69.5%	53.0%	57.8%	67.6%	66.1%
Second quarter	72.0%	70.2%	55.9%	59.2%	67.1%	66.9%
Third quarter	74.4%	67.5%	56.7%	58.5%	69.0%	64.9%
Fourth quarter	69.2%	56.6%	55.3%	54.1%	64.9%	55.9%
Fifth quarter	68.8%	n/a	55.0%	n/a	64.6%	n/a
Sixth quarter	66.7%	n/a	56.0%	n/a	63.5%	n/a
Seventh quarter	66.3%	n/a	50.7%	n/a	61.6%	n/a
Eighth quarter	66.0%	n/a	50.8%	n/a	61.3%	n/a

Employment Trends After Leaving Food Stamps

- Exhibit B-1 also shows that, among both one-parent and two-parent cases, the percentage with UI earnings declined steadily over time.

Employment Patterns Among the Survey Sample, by Ethnicity

- Exhibit B-2 presents the results of the UI wage record match for all sample members, by ethnicity.
- The data show that UI employment rates were much higher among blacks than among whites in both samples of leavers.
- However, the employment rate among blacks declined more over time than the employment rate among whites.

**EXHIBIT B-2
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WITH UI WAGES,
BY ETHNICITY**

Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	Black		White	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter left Food Stamps	76.3%	78.0%	57.6%	45.0%
First quarter	75.1%	75.0%	57.1%	50.6%
Second quarter	75.1%	77.4%	56.0%	48.2%
Third quarter	76.3%	75.3%	59.2%	46.2%
Fourth quarter	70.9%	63.1%	57.0%	43.5%
Fifth quarter	73.5%	n/a	52.3%	n/a
Sixth quarter	72.1%	n/a	51.6%	n/a
Seventh quarter	69.4%	n/a	50.8%	n/a
Eighth quarter	68.3%	n/a	51.9%	n/a

Employment Patterns Among the Survey Sample, by Age

- Exhibit B-3 presents the results of the UI wage record match for all sample members, by age group.
- The data indicate that, among the 1998-1999 leavers, the employment rate was highest among persons aged 25-39, and lowest among persons aged 18-24 and over 40.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, employment rates were generally highest among persons aged 25-34, and lowest among persons aged 40 and over.
- In both samples, employment rates declined in all age groups.

**EXHIBIT B-3
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WITH UI WAGES, BY AGE**

	1998-1999 Leavers				
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
Quarter left Food Stamps	58.4%	69.7%	71.9%	75.3%	64.7%
First quarter	59.5%	70.2%	70.7%	73.8%	60.4%
Second quarter	64.3%	70.3%	68.8%	74.6%	55.8%
Third quarter	63.7%	70.9%	71.6%	74.4%	62.1%
Fourth quarter	54.3%	70.9%	64.3%	71.7%	59.8%
Fifth quarter	58.8%	67.3%	64.3%	73.2%	57.8%
Sixth quarter	57.1%	69.6%	62.3%	69.4%	56.4%
Seventh quarter	50.8%	64.6%	60.8%	69.5%	59.1%
Eighth quarter	55.0%	67.5%	62.2%	62.7%	55.8%
	1999-2000 Leavers				
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
Quarter left Food Stamps	64.1%	74.4%	73.7%	63.8%	55.7%
First quarter	64.7%	74.6%	74.4%	60.3%	56.6%
Second quarter	70.6%	77.3%	68.8%	62.3%	54.7%
Third quarter	74.1%	72.7%	66.3%	54.5%	53.0%
Fourth quarter	58.1%	63.4%	62.7%	47.4%	46.3%

Employment Patterns Among the Survey Sample, by Education

- Exhibit B-4 presents the results of the UI wage record match for all sample members, by education.
- The data indicate that education was strongly correlated with having UI earnings in each quarter after leaving Food Stamps.
- Specifically, high school drop-outs generally had much lower employment rates than persons who had completed high school.

**EXHIBIT B-4
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS WITH UI WAGES, BY EDUCATION**

	Did Not Complete High School		Completed High School Only		Attended College	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps						
Quarter left Food Stamps	59.8%	48.4%	73.1%	74.7%	72.2%	70.7%
First quarter	58.5%	46.8%	72.5%	75.7%	69.8%	70.5%
Second quarter	61.9%	52.7%	70.2%	73.8%	67.3%	70.7%
Third quarter	63.1%	53.2%	72.1%	71.9%	70.3%	64.9%
Fourth quarter	56.0%	42.3%	68.0%	63.3%	71.5%	57.4%
Fifth quarter	54.8%	n/a	67.6%	n/a	72.9%	n/a
Sixth quarter	54.0%	n/a	66.9%	n/a	70.2%	n/a
Seventh quarter	51.1%	n/a	65.2%	n/a	69.2%	n/a
Eighth quarter	51.3%	n/a	65.7%	n/a	66.5%	n/a

Earnings Patterns Among the Survey Sample

- Exhibits B-5 and B-6 show the monthly earnings among employed members of the survey sample, based on the UI wage record data. The quarterly earnings amounts from the UI data were divided by three.
- The data show that sample members in one-parent cases had higher earnings on average than persons in two-parent cases.
- Earnings gains were apparent over time for all types of cases. For example, among the one-parent cases in the 1998-1999 sample, median earnings increased from \$944 in the first quarter after leaving Food Stamps to \$1,174 in the eighth quarter – an increase of 24 percent.

**EXHIBIT B-5
MEDIAN MONTHLY UI WAGES, HOUSEHOLD TYPE***

Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$878.64	\$1,006.95	\$723.23	\$791.83	\$845.75	\$951.11
First quarter	\$944.23	\$1,061.77	\$862.29	\$833.84	\$927.48	\$1,012.43
Second quarter	\$1,041.83	\$1,013.79	\$853.04	\$853.26	\$1,018.75	\$985.83
Third quarter	\$1,021.91	\$1,128.50	\$857.51	\$858.52	\$987.75	\$1,028.71
Fourth quarter	\$1,059.74	\$1,118.70	\$895.07	\$919.01	\$1,025.85	\$1,065.99
Fifth quarter	\$1,044.17	n/a	\$950.82	n/a	\$1,024.85	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$1,131.15	n/a	\$990.39	n/a	\$1,103.93	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$1,138.42	n/a	\$1,033.83	n/a	\$1,110.50	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$1,174.17	n/a	\$1,004.20	n/a	\$1,144.11	n/a

*Quarterly wages divided by three

**EXHIBIT B-6
MEAN UI WAGES (MONTHLY), BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$901.55	\$981.33	\$821.53	\$798.05	\$881.81	\$935.91
First quarter	\$988.44	\$1,091.33	\$937.18	\$892.55	\$976.11	\$1,040.07
Second quarter	\$1,037.32	\$1,057.97	\$990.95	\$895.58	\$1,025.49	\$1,015.38
Third quarter	\$1,044.92	\$1,113.64	\$949.12	\$927.15	\$1,020.80	\$1,064.00
Fourth quarter	\$1,111.24	\$1,101.59	\$958.28	\$1,009.69	\$1,071.32	\$1,075.14
Fifth quarter	\$1,116.44	n/a	\$1,001.09	n/a	\$1,086.34	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$1,184.94	n/a	\$1,005.84	n/a	\$1,136.50	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$1,168.73	n/a	\$1,082.17	n/a	\$1,146.88	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$1,175.53	n/a	\$1,053.47	n/a	\$1,144.57	n/a

Earnings Patterns Among the Survey Sample, by Ethnicity

- Exhibits B-7 and B-8 show UI earnings among employed members of the survey sample, by ethnicity.
- The data show that among the 1998-1999 leavers, there was not a great difference between blacks and whites in terms of earnings among employed persons. Among the 1999-2000 leavers, employed blacks had higher mean earnings than employed whites beginning in the second full quarter after leaving Food Stamps.

**EXHIBIT B-7
MEDIAN MONTHLY UI WAGES, BY ETHNICITY**

	Black		White	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps				
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$900.62	\$950.84	\$797.97	\$993.34
First quarter	\$913.70	\$1,025.53	\$931.86	\$980.56
Second quarter	\$1,020.67	\$1,016.03	\$1,016.79	\$663.20
Third quarter	\$995.75	\$1,092.18	\$943.56	\$783.90
Fourth quarter	\$1,034.55	\$1,121.21	\$995.74	\$794.43
Fifth quarter	\$1,023.47	n/a	\$1,028.12	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$1,100.34	n/a	\$1,078.14	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$1,111.94	n/a	\$1,059.84	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$1,142.42	n/a	\$1,131.70	n/a

**EXHIBIT B-8
MEAN UI WAGES (MONTHLY), BY ETHNICITY**

	Black		White	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps				
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$917.50	\$929.42	\$815.62	\$966.23
First quarter	\$966.37	\$1,031.23	\$983.97	\$1,068.30
Second quarter	\$1,006.14	\$1,043.95	\$1,057.77	\$940.46
Third quarter	\$1,020.53	\$1,088.39	\$1,004.48	\$996.34
Fourth quarter	\$1,085.02	\$1,120.81	\$1,039.79	\$949.16
Fifth quarter	\$1,056.25	n/a	\$1,141.68	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$1,117.50	n/a	\$1,165.97	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$1,140.84	n/a	\$1,149.53	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$1,133.50	n/a	\$1,152.00	n/a

Earnings Patterns Among the Survey Sample, by Education

- Exhibits B-9 and B-10 show the median earnings among employed members of the survey sample, by education.
- The data show that employed drop-outs had much lower UI earnings than employed persons who had completed high school.

**EXHIBIT B-9
MEDIAN MONTHLY UI WAGES, BY EDUCATION**

	Did Not Complete High School		Completed High School Only		Attended College	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps						
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$724.52	\$754.68	\$907.53	\$1,014.74	\$827.39	\$978.67
First quarter	\$805.01	\$702.61	\$1,031.91	\$1,068.23	\$998.75	\$1,117.61
Second quarter	\$741.80	\$541.98	\$1,125.71	\$1,113.10	\$1,041.64	\$979.95
Third quarter	\$732.67	\$665.21	\$1,113.50	\$1,169.12	\$1,144.46	\$1,118.81
Fourth quarter	\$777.32	\$664.63	\$1,074.67	\$1,123.33	\$1,205.26	\$1,218.00
Fifth quarter	\$795.28	n/a	\$1,102.34	N/a	\$1,210.55	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$807.01	n/a	\$1,202.56	N/a	\$1,261.40	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$854.12	n/a	\$1,154.61	N/a	\$1,277.65	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$724.02	n/a	\$1,228.90	N/a	\$1,223.18	n/a

**EXHIBIT B-10
MEAN UI WAGES (MONTHLY), BY EDUCATION**

	Did Not Complete High School		Completed High School		Attended College	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Quarter After Leaving Food Stamps						
Quarter left Food Stamps	\$781.06	\$782.85	\$927.78	\$972.74	\$914.90	\$989.83
First quarter	\$803.71	\$801.76	\$1,031.50	\$1,107.07	\$1,065.43	\$1,091.83
Second quarter	\$790.67	\$668.91	\$1,111.34	\$1,165.19	\$1,144.03	\$1,012.58
Third quarter	\$764.82	\$705.83	\$1,104.23	\$1,192.72	\$1,159.28	\$1,139.94
Fourth quarter	\$852.35	\$734.77	\$1,121.55	\$1,160.29	\$1,229.93	\$1,202.72
Fifth quarter	\$831.95	n/a	\$1,151.54	n/a	\$1,239.44	n/a
Sixth quarter	\$853.81	n/a	\$1,215.38	n/a	\$1,302.22	n/a
Seventh quarter	\$915.18	n/a	\$1,194.72	n/a	\$1,311.14	n/a
Eighth quarter	\$873.41	n/a	\$1,236.23	n/a	\$1,244.70	n/a

C. FOOD STAMP PARTICIPATION

This section presents data from the SCDSS automated Food Stamp system showing rates of Food Stamp participation among all sample members in the period after leaving Food Stamps. The data are presented for each month in the period after sample members left Food Stamps.

Overall Rates of Food Stamp Participation, by Case Type

- Exhibit B-11 shows the rate of subsequent Food Stamp participation among sample members after leaving Food Stamps, by case type.
- The data show that the rate of Food Stamp participation increased steadily over time, reaching almost 28 percent among the 1998-1999 leavers at the end of two years, and 28 percent of the 1999-2000 leavers after 15 months.
- Among the 1998-1999 leavers, the recidivism rates did not vary greatly between one-parent and two-parent cases.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, recidivism rates were also similar for one-parent and two-parent cases until about 10 months after exit, when the rate among one-parent cases began to exceed that of two-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT B-11
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

Percent Receiving Food Stamps	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	6.8%	3.7%	5.7%	3.7%	6.5%	3.7%
4 months after exit	13.4%	8.5%	10.9%	7.6%	12.6%	8.3%
5 months after exit	19.0%	12.9%	14.4%	14.5%	17.6%	13.4%
6 months after exit	20.0%	18.0%	17.1%	18.8%	19.1%	18.2%
7 months after exit	22.6%	21.4%	18.5%	21.1%	21.3%	21.3%
8 months after exit	23.5%	24.4%	21.3%	20.0%	22.9%	23.1%
9 months after exit	24.2%	21.8%	23.9%	20.4%	24.1%	21.4%
10 months after exit	22.8%	21.5%	25.2%	23.9%	23.5%	22.2%
11 months after exit	23.8%	25.7%	25.9%	22.3%	24.4%	24.7%
12 months after exit	24.6%	27.0%	24.3%	21.0%	24.5%	25.2%
13 months after exit	23.1%	27.0%	24.0%	20.0%	23.4%	24.9%
14 months after exit	22.3%	30.3%	25.1%	20.0%	23.2%	27.3%
15 months after exit	21.3%	30.6%	24.8%	21.6%	22.4%	28.0%
16 months after exit	24.1%	n/a	24.1%	n/a	24.1%	n/a
17 months after exit	24.8%	n/a	23.2%	n/a	24.4%	n/a
18 months after exit	26.0%	n/a	24.4%	n/a	25.5%	n/a
19 months after exit	26.8%	n/a	24.9%	n/a	26.2%	n/a
20 months after exit	25.7%	n/a	26.9%	n/a	26.1%	n/a
21 months after exit	26.8%	n/a	26.1%	n/a	26.5%	n/a
22 months after exit	28.2%	n/a	26.3%	n/a	27.6%	n/a
23 months after exit	27.9%	n/a	25.2%	n/a	27.1%	n/a
24 months after exit	25.6%	n/a	24.3%	n/a	25.2%	n/a
25 months after exit	25.6%	n/a	25.0%	n/a	25.4%	n/a
26 months after exit	26.2%	n/a	26.3%	n/a	26.2%	n/a
27 months after exit	27.5%	n/a	27.8%	n/a	27.6%	n/a

Food Stamp Participation, by Ethnicity

- Exhibit B-12 shows the rate of Food Stamp participation among sample members, by ethnicity.
- The data show that among the 1998-1999 leavers, the recidivism rate was higher among blacks, especially during the first year after exit.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, the recidivism rate among blacks did not begin to exceed that of whites until month 12 after exit.

**EXHIBIT B-12
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS,
BY ETHNICITY**

Percent Receiving Food Stamps	Black		White	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	8.1%	3.9%	4.3%	3.4%
4 months after exit	14.9%	8.6%	9.7%	7.9%
5 months after exit	19.8%	15.5%	15.0%	9.8%
6 months after exit	21.5%	18.5%	16.4%	18.3%
7 months after exit	25.0%	20.2%	16.8%	24.0%
8 months after exit	25.8%	23.0%	19.0%	23.7%
9 months after exit	27.7%	20.6%	19.2%	23.1%
10 months after exit	27.1%	21.6%	18.7%	23.8%
11 months after exit	28.0%	24.5%	19.6%	25.9%
12 months after exit	27.0%	25.8%	21.3%	24.9%
13 months after exit	25.7%	25.8%	20.6%	24.0%
14 months after exit	25.3%	29.2%	20.7%	24.5%
15 months after exit	24.2%	29.4%	20.4%	25.8%
16 months after exit	27.0%	n/a	20.4%	n/a
17 months after exit	27.6%	n/a	20.3%	n/a
18 months after exit	29.8%	n/a	19.9%	n/a
19 months after exit	31.2%	n/a	19.6%	n/a
20 months after exit	30.8%	n/a	19.6%	n/a
21 months after exit	31.4%	n/a	19.9%	n/a
22 months after exit	31.8%	n/a	22.1%	n/a
23 months after exit	31.8%	n/a	20.5%	n/a
24 months after exit	29.8%	n/a	19.0%	n/a
25 months after exit	29.6%	n/a	20.0%	n/a
26 months after exit	29.3%	n/a	21.7%	n/a
27 months after exit	31.4%	n/a	22.0%	n/a

Food Stamp Participation, by Age

- Exhibit B-13 shows the rate of Food Stamp participation among sample members, by age group.
- The data show that among the 1998-1999 leavers, recidivism was generally much higher among persons aged 18-34 than among older persons.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, recidivism was highest among persons aged 18-24 and lowest among persons aged 40 and older.

**EXHIBIT B-13
PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS,
BY AGE**

	1998-1999 Leavers				
Percent Receiving Food Stamps	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	14.7%	8.3%	6.1%	1.3%	3.9%
4 months after exit	19.9%	14.0%	14.3%	9.5%	6.7%
5 months after exit	25.3%	18.4%	19.9%	15.1%	10.7%
6 months after exit	25.0%	21.7%	19.0%	18.2%	13.2%
7 months after exit	28.4%	22.9%	21.7%	19.7%	15.8%
8 months after exit	27.8%	24.1%	24.6%	19.8%	18.8%
9 months after exit	31.7%	25.8%	25.7%	19.6%	19.0%
10 months after exit	30.4%	28.4%	25.3%	15.4%	18.5%
11 months after exit	29.8%	29.9%	24.9%	17.5%	20.3%
12 months after exit	29.7%	30.8%	23.9%	16.0%	22.2%
13 months after exit	28.1%	28.4%	23.0%	18.2%	19.7%
14 months after exit	26.4%	27.8%	23.0%	19.0%	19.8%
15 months after exit	23.0%	27.0%	24.2%	17.7%	18.9%
16 months after exit	21.2%	26.7%	28.8%	19.3%	21.7%
17 months after exit	21.7%	25.9%	28.1%	22.4%	21.8%
18 months after exit	25.1%	26.9%	28.9%	22.6%	23.0%
19 months after exit	26.6%	29.3%	27.1%	24.3%	23.6%
20 months after exit	31.3%	29.6%	26.8%	23.6%	20.0%
21 months after exit	30.7%	29.9%	27.0%	25.1%	20.8%
22 months after exit	31.5%	30.3%	30.2%	25.8%	20.6%
23 months after exit	32.3%	31.2%	29.2%	23.2%	19.7%
24 months after exit	27.0%	29.1%	30.6%	21.8%	16.0%
25 months after exit	28.5%	30.1%	33.0%	18.0%	15.2%
26 months after exit	29.5%	32.9%	31.1%	17.8%	17.8%
27 months after exit	32.0%	31.4%	33.2%	19.2%	20.8%

	1999-2000 Leavers				
Percent Receiving Food Stamps	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	3.4%	8.1%	3.5%	1.4%	2.0%
4 months after exit	10.2%	14.2%	4.5%	6.1%	5.8%
5 months after exit	13.7%	21.2%	10.6%	7.0%	13.6%
6 months after exit	22.7%	22.3%	14.8%	13.3%	16.2%
7 months after exit	24.3%	27.8%	21.6%	18.6%	13.5%
8 months after exit	28.5%	31.3%	23.4%	18.3%	12.2%
9 months after exit	24.1%	29.0%	22.4%	18.5%	12.2%
10 months after exit	31.1%	24.3%	20.6%	17.0%	14.9%
11 months after exit	35.1%	27.0%	20.2%	24.6%	14.0%
12 months after exit	33.2%	28.0%	19.9%	29.1%	14.7%
13 months after exit	30.3%	28.0%	20.8%	29.4%	15.9%
14 months after exit	35.0%	29.8%	22.9%	31.6%	16.1%
15 months after exit	38.8%	28.0%	23.1%	30.9%	16.8%

Food Stamp Participation, by Education

- Exhibit B-14 shows the rate of Food Stamp participation among sample members, by education.
- The data show that recidivism was higher among high school drop-outs, followed by persons who had completed high school only. Among the 1998-1999 leavers, 41 percent of the high school drop-outs were back on Food Stamps at 27 months after exit.

EXHIBIT B-14 PERCENT OF SAMPLE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY EDUCATION

	Did Not Complete High School		Completed High School Only		Attended College	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
Percent Receiving Food Stamps						
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	9.7%	4.0%	5.0%	4.6%	4.8%	1.2%
4 months after exit	16.9%	9.2%	9.6%	9.0%	13.4%	5.1%
5 months after exit	21.1%	12.3%	13.2%	11.9%	23.6%	18.2%
6 months after exit	22.9%	20.6%	15.4%	17.3%	23.0%	17.0%
7 months after exit	27.1%	23.4%	17.4%	20.8%	22.4%	19.5%
8 months after exit	28.6%	26.5%	20.2%	22.3%	20.4%	20.2%
9 months after exit	29.9%	23.7%	21.2%	21.3%	21.9%	18.4%
10 months after exit	30.1%	27.8%	21.3%	21.8%	18.3%	15.5%
11 months after exit	32.7%	31.1%	21.6%	24.9%	18.1%	15.6%
12 months after exit	33.3%	31.8%	21.9%	24.6%	16.3%	17.7%
13 months after exit	32.8%	31.1%	20.4%	23.9%	15.4%	18.9%
14 months after exit	31.5%	34.4%	21.4%	26.1%	13.7%	20.2%
15 months after exit	29.0%	32.3%	21.2%	28.6%	14.3%	20.8%
16 months after exit	30.5%	n/a	23.5%	n/a	14.5%	n/a
17 months after exit	32.7%	n/a	22.7%	n/a	14.5%	n/a
18 months after exit	35.7%	n/a	22.9%	n/a	15.1%	n/a
19 months after exit	38.2%	n/a	23.4%	n/a	13.4%	n/a
20 months after exit	38.2%	n/a	24.3%	n/a	10.1%	n/a
21 months after exit	37.4%	n/a	24.9%	n/a	12.3%	n/a
22 months after exit	36.4%	n/a	27.2%	n/a	13.8%	n/a
23 months after exit	35.7%	n/a	25.9%	n/a	15.3%	n/a
24 months after exit	37.3%	n/a	23.4%	n/a	9.5%	n/a
25 months after exit	37.6%	n/a	22.6%	n/a	12.3%	n/a
26 months after exit	38.9%	n/a	22.9%	n/a	13.5%	n/a
27 months after exit	41.2%	n/a	24.4%	n/a	12.8%	n/a

D. TANF PARTICIPATION

- Exhibit B-15 shows the rate of TANF participation among sample members after leaving Food Stamps, by case type.
- The data show very low rates of TANF participation among both the samples, regardless of case type.

**EXHIBIT B-15
PERCENT OF SAMPLE RECEIVING TANF,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

Percent Receiving TANF	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
1 month after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4 months after exit	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
5 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6 months after exit	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
7 months after exit	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%
8 months after exit	0.5%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%
9 months after exit	0.6%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	0.7%	0.3%
10 months after exit	0.4%	2.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.5%
11 months after exit	1.0%	2.1%	1.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.4%
12 months after exit	0.8%	2.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.9%	2.1%
13 months after exit	0.8%	2.8%	1.5%	0.9%	1.0%	2.2%
14 months after exit	1.5%	2.8%	0.8%	1.2%	1.3%	2.3%
15 months after exit	1.9%	3.6%	1.5%	2.0%	1.7%	3.2%
16 months after exit	2.7%	n/a	1.5%	n/a	2.3%	n/a
17 months after exit	2.4%	n/a	2.1%	n/a	2.3%	n/a
18 months after exit	2.4%	n/a	1.5%	n/a	2.1%	n/a
19 months after exit	2.3%	n/a	2.8%	n/a	2.4%	n/a
20 months after exit	2.7%	n/a	2.4%	n/a	2.6%	n/a
21 months after exit	3.5%	n/a	1.8%	n/a	3.0%	n/a
22 months after exit	3.9%	n/a	2.2%	n/a	3.4%	n/a
23 months after exit	4.5%	n/a	2.8%	n/a	4.0%	n/a
24 months after exit	3.7%	n/a	1.6%	n/a	3.0%	n/a
25 months after exit	3.8%	n/a	1.6%	n/a	3.1%	n/a
26 months after exit	4.0%	n/a	2.4%	n/a	3.5%	n/a
27 months after exit	3.8%	n/a	3.0%	n/a	3.5%	n/a

E. MEDICAID PARTICIPATION

- Exhibit B-16 presents data on the percentage of families in which the parent(s) or one of the children were receiving Medicaid during the tracking period.
- Among the 1998-1999 leavers, Medicaid participation among the one-parent families declined slightly from 64 percent at exit from Food Stamps to about 60 percent at two years after exit.
- Among the two-parent families in the 1998-1999 sample, Medicaid participation was relatively stable at between 50 percent and 55 percent.
- Among the 1999-2000 leavers, Medicaid participation by one-parent cases remained mostly in the 58 percent to 62 percent range during the two-year tracking period.
- Among two-parent cases in the 1999-2000 leavers, Medicaid participation declined from 60 percent at exit to 53 percent at 12 months after exit, but then increased to 58 percent at 18 months.

**EXHIBIT B-16
PERCENT OF SAMPLE RECEIVING MEDICAID,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE**

Percent Receiving Medicaid	1-parent		2-parent		Total	
	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers	1998-1999 Leavers	1999-2000 Leavers
1 month after exit	64.1%	61.5%	55.3%	60.5%	61.4%	61.2%
2 months after exit	64.3%	62.3%	54.5%	59.5%	61.3%	61.5%
3 months after exit	62.9%	63.1%	53.9%	58.5%	60.1%	61.7%
4 months after exit	62.6%	61.9%	54.1%	58.3%	60.0%	60.8%
5 months after exit	62.8%	61.5%	54.3%	59.0%	60.2%	60.8%
6 months after exit	63.6%	60.4%	54.0%	58.3%	60.6%	59.8%
7 months after exit	63.6%	58.2%	54.8%	58.9%	60.9%	58.4%
8 months after exit	64.0%	59.1%	54.2%	57.7%	61.0%	58.7%
9 months after exit	63.4%	59.4%	55.2%	55.7%	60.9%	58.3%
10 months after exit	63.6%	58.4%	54.6%	55.0%	60.9%	57.4%
11 months after exit	63.3%	58.6%	55.3%	53.5%	60.9%	57.1%
12 months after exit	62.4%	57.7%	54.9%	53.4%	60.1%	56.5%
13 months after exit	60.6%	57.7%	54.7%	54.4%	58.8%	56.8%
14 months after exit	60.5%	59.3%	55.8%	54.6%	59.0%	57.9%
15 months after exit	60.5%	58.8%	56.6%	55.9%	59.3%	58.0%
16 months after exit	60.7%	60.6%	56.2%	57.0%	59.3%	59.5%
17 months after exit	60.9%	59.3%	55.2%	55.9%	59.1%	58.3%
18 months after exit	61.3%	61.3%	53.0%	58.2%	58.8%	60.4%
19 months after exit	60.9%	n/a	52.8%	n/a	58.4%	n/a
20 months after exit	59.6%	n/a	52.7%	n/a	57.5%	n/a
21 months after exit	60.3%	n/a	52.1%	n/a	57.8%	n/a
22 months after exit	61.8%	n/a	52.5%	n/a	59.0%	n/a
23 months after exit	60.9%	n/a	51.7%	n/a	58.1%	n/a
24 months after exit	59.7%	n/a	52.5%	n/a	57.5%	n/a
25 months after exit	59.6%	n/a	52.5%	n/a	57.4%	n/a
26 months after exit	60.8%	n/a	53.2%	n/a	58.5%	n/a
27 months after exit	60.4%	n/a	53.3%	n/a	58.2%	n/a
28 months after exit	60.2%	n/a	51.8%	n/a	57.6%	n/a
29 months after exit	59.2%	n/a	50.2%	n/a	56.4%	n/a
30 months after exit	57.4%	n/a	51.0%	n/a	55.5%	n/a

F. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This section briefly reviews the findings from the administrative records data in relation to the survey findings, recognizing the limitations discussed previously on the comparability of the two sources of information.

Employment Situation

- The findings on UI employment among the samples are consistent with the survey results in showing that rates of employment were higher among one-parent cases than among two-parent cases.
- The UI data are also consistent with the survey data in showing much higher rates of employment among blacks than among whites.
- In addition, the UI data are consistent with the survey data in showing that high school drop-outs have much lower rates of employment than persons who have completed high school.

Earnings

- The findings on UI earnings among the samples are consistent with the survey results in showing that earnings were higher among employed persons in one-parent cases were higher than earnings among employed persons in two-parent cases.
- The UI data are consistent with the survey data in showing higher earnings among blacks than among whites in the 1999-2000 sample.
- Finally, the UI data are consistent with the survey data in showing that employed high school drop-outs have much lower earnings than employed persons who have completed high school.

Recidivism

- The findings from the administrative records are consistent with the survey findings in showing that the recidivism rate was higher among one-parent cases than two-parent cases in the 1999-2000 sample.
- With regard to the 1998-1999 sample, the administrative data showed no difference between the one-parent and two-parent cases in the recidivism rate at 12 months after exit. The survey data showed that the recidivism rate was slightly higher among the one-parent cases, although the difference between one-parent and two-parent cases was not statistically significant.

- The administrative records data were consistent with the survey data in showing higher recidivism rates among blacks than whites.
- The administrative records data were consistent with the survey data in showing higher recidivism rates among younger persons than older persons.
- The administrative records data were consistent with the survey data in showing that recidivism was higher among high school drop-outs than among persons who had completed high school